







THE CONTENTS AND ORIGIN  
OF  
THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES,  
CRITICALLY INVESTIGATED.



THE CONTENTS AND ORIGIN  
OF  
THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES,  
CRITICALLY INVESTIGATED.

BY  
DR. EDWARD ZELLER.

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED,  
DR. F. OVERBECK'S INTRODUCTION TO THE ACTS.  
FROM DE WETTE'S HANDBOOK.  
TRANSLATED BY JOSEPH DARE, B.A.,  
FORMERLY HIBBERT SCHOLAR.

VOL. I



WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,  
14, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON;  
AND 20, SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.

1875.



## PREFATORY NOTICE.

---

THE present work of Professor Zeller is so well known as to need no introduction. Following out the hints of Schneckenburger, the importance of which had been apprehended by Baur and Schwegler, the distinguished author wrote a series of elaborate articles in the Tubingen Journal. These were subsequently revised, for the purpose of a separate work. The publication thence resulting is an epoch-making one, evincing the highest critical ability, and propounding a tendency which actuated the writer of the Acts, in harmony with the leading opinions of the Tubingen School. The impossibility of reconciling the Apostle Paul's statements and conduct, as seen in his Epistles, with those in the Acts, and the conciliatory motive which prompted and moulded the latter, are set forth with great skill.

As the work was published in 1854, it has been thought desirable to give a specimen of the later literature on the same book of the New Testament, for which purpose Overbeck's Introduction to his edition of De Wette's Commentary has been selected.

That the views of Zeller are substantially correct can hardly be doubted, though some details are perhaps pushed to an extreme. Every succeeding commentary on this book has been more or less influenced by them; and perhaps they are now accepted

in essence by most theologians who are free to follow truth wherever it leads them. Among purely English works they are presented in a somewhat modified form in Davidson's Introduction to the New Testament, published by Longmans. Along with Overbeck's investigations, the critical and extended examination of the philosophic thinker belonging to the University of Berlin is now put before the British reader, who is requested to peruse them with attention, and judge of their force. That they have been controverted need scarcely be mentioned ; but their force does not seem to be much impaired by the apologetic arguments of Lekebusch, Meyer and others No manipulation can obliterate the fact that the St Paul of the Acts differs considerably from the St. Paul of such Epistles as rightly bear his name ; so that the alternative lies between believing his own words, or the unknown writer who describes him long after in the Acts of the Apostles It need not be questioned that an historical basis underlies many of the narratives in the Acts ; but the object of the writer has given a peculiar character to the sayings and doings of the great Apostle which can hardly be accepted without considerable deduction The Petrine and Pauline parties, which subsequently merged into and formed the Catholic Church, began to approach one another under various influences ; not the least of which proceeded from the writers who presented the Apostles in the light of concessions to one another's opinions, or of men harmonizing in essential principles. Hence the author of the Acts presents St. Paul and St. Peter very much as counterparts

## CONTENTS.

### INTRODUCTION TO THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. By Dr. F.

OVERBECK . . . . .	1
Title, Plan and Chronology . . . . .	3
Standpoint and Aim of the Book . . . . .	13
Sources of the Book . . . . .	31
Other Sources of the Book . . . . .	54
Trustworthiness; Time and Place of Writing; Person of the Author . . . . .	64
Exegetical Aids . . . . .	80

### ZELLER'S ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

PREFACE . . . . .	85
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	89

### PART I.

#### EXTERNAL EVIDENCES OF THE EXISTENCE AND ORIGIN OF THE WRITINGS OF LUKE.

1. Prior to Marcion and Justin . . . . .	93
2. Marcion . . . . .	98
3. Justin . . . . .	114
4. Ignatius, Polycarp, the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions . . . . .	140
5. The Younger Gnostics, Celsus, Theophilus, Tatian .	153
6. Irenæus and later Authors; Retrospect . . . . .	158

## PART II.

## THE HISTORICAL SUBJECT-MATTER OF THE ACTS.

<b>A.—THE ORIGINAL APOSTLES AND THE CHURCH AT JERUSALEM</b>	<b>165</b>
1. The Ascension and the Apostolic Election . . . . .	165
2. The Feast of Pentecost . . . . .	171
3. The Internal Condition of the Primitive Church ; the Miraculous Activity of the Apostles; the Com- munity of Property ; Ananias and Sapphira . . . . .	209
4. The Primitive Church and the Jews; the First Per- secutions . . . . .	215
Theudas . . . . .	223
Gamaliel . . . . .	229
Herod Agrippa . . . . .	232
Liberation of Peter	234
<b>B.—THE FORERUNNERS OF PAUL.</b> . . . . .	<b>237</b>
1. Stephen . . . . .	237
2. Christianity in Samaria ; Philip ; Simon Magus ; the Baptism of the Ethiopian . . . . .	245
3. Peter at Joppa and Cæsarea ; Cornelius . . . . .	269
<b>C.—PAUL.</b> . . . . .	<b>284</b>
1. Conversion and First Appearance of Paul . . . . .	284
2. Paul after his Conversion . . . . .	295

INTRODUCTION  
TO  
THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

BY FRANZ OVERBECK.



## INTRODUCTION TO THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

### 1a.—TITLE, PLAN AND CHRONOLOGY.

THE title of the work, *πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων*,<sup>1</sup> “Acts of the Apostles,” though no doubt ancient, was not prefixed by the author himself, nor does it express with precision the object and contents of the work. For, in the first place, the book recounts, in addition, the doings of certain teachers who were not Apostles in the sense attached to the term in the language of the Church and in the title (vide vi. 8—viii. 1; viii. 4 sqq.; xi. 19 sqq.); nor should we be justified in taking the word in a sense wider than this. Secondly, of the Apostles, thus strictly understood, only Peter and Paul appear as prominent actors, John and James presenting themselves only incidentally. Thirdly, though the author furnishes a considerable quantity of matter belonging to the personal history of the former two great Apostles, and though, from ch. xiii., everything centres round the person of Paul, yet the information and observations recorded in regard to the foundation, growth and internal development of the Church,<sup>2</sup> clearly show that the aim of the book is something

<sup>1</sup> In this form the title already appears in *Clement of Alexandria*, *Strom.* v. 12, 8, p. 696, Pott. *Lachmann* and *Tischendorf*, following the codices B and D and ¶ at the close of the book, read *πράξεις ἀποστόλων*; D has *πράξις ἀποστόλων*; ¶ in the title has only *πράξης*. *Irenaeus*, *Adv. Hær.* iii. 13, 8; 15, 1; *Tertullian*, *Adv. Marc.* v. 2, and frequently the Canon of Muratori, have *Acta Apostolorum*.

<sup>2</sup> Vide . 7 sq., 15—26; ii. 1 sqq., 41 sqq.; iv. 32 sqq.; v. 12 sqq.; vi. 1—7; viii. 4 sqq. 25; ix. 15, 31, 35, 42; xi. 19 sqq. 26; xii. 24; xiii. 48 sq.; xiv. 21 sqq. 27; xv. 1—35; xvi. 5; xviii. 11; xix. 10, 20.

more comprehensive than is indicated by the title. Moreover, it is only with this wider aim that the fact of the book having been intended as the second part of the history of the Gospel addressed to Theophilus is compatible (i. 1., cf. Luke i. 1—3). No further proof is now needed that the MS. title of the Acts of the Apostles is not traceable in any of the traditional forms to the author of the book, nor that even in its oldest form (*πράξεις ἀπ.* or *τῶν ἀπ.*), it belongs, like the superscriptions of the books of the New Testament in general, to the first collectors and arrangers of the Canon. Nor is it in any case permissible to attribute this title to any insight into the deeper plan of the work, for which it is far too indefinite and general<sup>1</sup>. At the same time, however, the title is not purely arbitrary, but is manifestly derived from the initial phrases of the book: nor is it inappropriate, so far at least as, judging by these phrases, the antithesis between this, his second, and his earlier work rested, to the author's mind, upon the difference between the prominent actors in the story. That from now forth the Apostles have to play their part as such, appears also from the list of Apostles which the author has prefixed to his narrative (i. 13), where, too, the Hellenists are represented as standing under their supreme authority. If, however, in the book itself the interest, as regards the Apostles personally, is reduced even to the extent of the complete disappearance of most of them, this, nevertheless, is a circumstance which does not exclude the possibility of the author having believed that he was giving a history of the Apostles,

<sup>1</sup> In opposition to the theory of *Meyer*, who defends the title, observing that “the development and extension of the Church, which form the general contents of the book, represent precisely the work accomplished by the Apostles, and more particularly by Peter (ch. ii.—xii.) and Paul (ch. xiii.—xxviii.).” He adds that the superscription, *πράξεις ἀποστόλων* (without the article), which is perhaps the oldest, is even more appropriate to the special contents of the work. But if this superscription rests on the reflection that the Acts of the Apostles reports the doings, not of all, but, in effect, only of two of the Apostles, then it is also certainly not original. For then, again, it would be incomprehensibly inexplicit (instead of reading, for instance, *Πράξεις Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου*). If, therefore, *πράξεις ἀποστόλων* is not a correction of a later time, the absence of the article is only to be dealt with on the principle laid down in *Winer*, Gram. § 19, 1.

any more than the fragmentary tradition contained in his Gospel respecting the person of Jesus disproves his belief that he had there presented a complete history of the words and deeds of Jesus (Luke i. 1). For it is quite arbitrary to assume that the author took any further interest in the Apostles personally than that which appears in his book ; or that, so far as he was concerned, the history of the Apostles was not exhausted precisely in that which he relates of it.

In reference to the title of the Acts of the Apostles, therefore,—although we may say that it discloses to the reader nothing as to the object of the book,—to assert, as Reuss does, that it conceals that object, and “excites expectations which the author had no intention of satisfying,”<sup>1</sup> would be incorrect, except from the point of view of the critic who has compared the proportion subsisting between the actual contents of the Acts of the Apostles and the sum-total of the historical facts and materials on which the book is founded. Nor may we take the third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles as connected together in their contents in such a way that the latter book would have to be regarded, as it is by De Wette, as forming *the second part of the history of the Gospel addressed to Theophilus*. With respect to their subject-matter, on the contrary, the Gospel and the Acts (i. 1) are distinguished from each other as the history of Jesus and the history of his Apostles, and the tie connecting the two books lies not in their immediate contents, but in the ideas applied to two different periods of history. The two works are accordingly not executed upon a uniform plan laid out in their subject-matter—indeed, for such a plan, the (literary) conditions under which the author worked were too dissimilar in the two cases—and it is only in their unexpressed general aim that their unity consists. In this sense, however, the two works may no doubt originally have formed a whole ; nor, rightly understood, does the modified form in which the account of the Ascension appears in the Acts (i. 2 sqq.), as compared with that given in the Gospel, exclude

<sup>1</sup> *Reuss, Geschichte der heiligen Schriften. N. T. § 202, p. 195, ed. 4.*

the possibility of the two books having originated at the same time (contrary to the opinions of Reuss and others).<sup>1</sup>

The work is executed more systematically, because more independently, than the Gospel of Luke. While the opening section of the book (i. 1—14), which is a repetition in fuller detail of the account of *Christ's Ascension*, forms the connecting link with the first part (or Gospel), the *aim and plan of the work* are sketched out by the words of the departing Lord (verse 8): “Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth.” Then, after the *number of the Apostles* who are to be the witnesses has been *filled up* (i. 15—26), we have the fulfilment of the promise that had been given, by the *pouring out of the Holy Spirit*; and, herewith, the first testimony is borne by Peter, a great multitude of believers is added to the small number of the disciples, and a congregation is formed (ch ii.). We are next told *how the Apostles*, in the power of the Spirit, *continuic to bear witness in Jerusalem, and this in spite of the persecution then commencing; while the form which the inner life of the Church*

<sup>1</sup> These observations rest on the supposition that the reference in the prologue, Luke i. 1—4, cannot be extended to the Acts of the Apostles also, as is often assumed (cf. Schleiermacher, Einl. pp. 346 sqq., 360 sqq.; Credner, Einl. pp. 268, 270, 280 sqq.; Meyer, p. 8; Baur, Kanon. Evv., pp. 518 sqq.; Volkmar, Ev Marcions, pp. 286 sq.; Renan, Les Apôtres, p. xxi; &c.). This supposition is a natural inference from the parallel relation of the prologue in Luke and the prologue in the Acts, i. 1 sq.—a relation founded partly on the position of the two passages, and partly on the fact that they are the only two passages in which the author appears in his own words as the writer. Under this mutual relationship of the two passages we cannot well assume otherwise than that they are to be treated as co-ordinate, and that consequently the initial phrases of the Acts have the same significance for the succeeding narrative as Luke i. 1—4 has for the preceding, and that the author, in case his Gospel and the Acts were originally intended to have formed a whole, puts a limit to the reference in his earlier words, Luke i. 1 sq., by the passage, i. 1 sq. in the Acts, or interposes once again, speaking in his own name, only because the scope of his earlier remarks has been exhausted. But the contents also of the prologue of the Gospel are against extending the reference there to the Acts of the Apostles (vide Schneckenburger, pp. 7 sqq.; Zeller, pp. 316 sq.; Lekebusch, p. 28); and hence it is rightly rejected also by Reuss, loc. cit.; Thiersch, Versuch zur Herstellung, &c., p. 163; Oertel, Paul in der Apostelgesch., pp. 40 sq.; and others.

assumes, is also depicted (iii. 1—vi. 7). The *martyrdom of Stephen* glorifies the cause of Christ (vi. 8—viii. 3), and, at the same time, causes the *Gospel to spread to Samaria and elsewhere* (viii. 4—40). With this event is connected the *conversion of Saul*, the future Apostle of the Gentiles (ix. 1—31). After *labouring in various places in Judaea* (ix. 32—43), Peter makes a commencement of the work of converting the Gentiles in the person of the *centurion Cornelius* and his house—a step which he justifies before the Apostles at Jerusalem (x. 1—xi. 18). *Christianity is proclaimed by exiles to the Gentiles in Antioch* also, and Barnabas joins Paul in his labours in this city (xi. 19—30). After an episode from the history of Peter (xii.), Paul, acting at first in concert with Barnabas, at length appears as a *missionary of the Gospel in the countries of the Gentiles*, always addressing the Jews in the first place, but turning to the Gentiles when the former prove stubborn (xiii. and xiv.). The admission of the Gentiles is justified by the Apostles in Jerusalem (xv. 1—35). Then Paul, no longer accompanied by Barnabas, advances still further into the countries of the Gentiles, and reaches Greece (xv. 36—xviii. 17). After having again visited the churches founded in Galatia and Phrygia, he labours for some considerable time in Ephesus (xviii. 18—xix. 40). Then follow the return of Paul to Macedonia and Greece, his journey to Jerusalem, his arrest there, his imprisonment in Cæsarea and journey to Rome, where he preaches without hindrance for two years, and thus carries the testimony of Christ to the remote West [cf. i. 8] (ch. xx.—xxviii.). The word of the Lord (i. 8) being thus fulfilled, the narrative breaks off.

There is not, strictly speaking, any subdivision of the book into parts and sections. Nevertheless, the book falls pretty naturally into two parts, the first comprising chapters i to xii., and the second, chapters xiii. to xxviii. There are likewise transitions and pauses, dividing the story into sections, those in the first part being found at ii. 42—47; iv. 32—37; v. 12—16; v. 42; vi. 7; viii. 1—3; ix. 31; and xii. 24 sq.; while those in

the second part are at xiv. 27 and xv. 35. From this last point the narrative for the most part proceeds continuously, because it hinges exclusively on the person of Paul.

That a plan has been followed in the narrative of the Acts may be seen if, in attempting to discover it, we direct our attention, in the first place, simply to the arrangement of the book, or to the grouping of the stories according to the external relationship of their contents and the external motives of their connection; and if, at the same time, we entirely disregard the fundamental thought or aim which dominates the narrative of the Acts. Even in this external sense, however, the plan of the book is but imperfectly grasped in the foregoing observations of De Wette; it is not pursued deeply enough into detail, however correctly the significance of the passage, i. 8, as regards the progress of the narrative is in general appreciated. Nor have the passages which De Wette describes as pauses in the narrative, by any means always the significance of external incisions into it (*vide vi. 7*). And in this respect there exists no essential distinction between the Pauline portion of the book and that which precedes, since here too, in spite of the unity imparted to the narrative by the person of Paul, the thread of the story is—and, considering the multifarious character of the narrative and its defectiveness in point of matter, cannot but be—far too little free from interruptions to justify the assertion that the narrative “for the most part proceeds continuously” (cf. the fresh starts made at xv. 1; xviii. 24; xxi. 15; xxvii. 1; xxviii. 17; and the pauses at xvi. 4 sq.; xix. 20 sq.; xxiv. 24—27).

Considered from the external points of view just described, we may no doubt distinguish a part of the book which concerns the person of Paul from the part which precedes, and where Paul is either not mentioned at all, or is only referred to casually; and it is with justice that most of the commentators oppose to each other the sections, ch. i.—xii. and ch. xiii.—xxviii., as the first and second parts of the Acts of the Apostles, since indeed the writer himself also clearly makes a fresh start at xiii. 1.

The first part again falls into a first section, the subject of which is the primitive congregation under the exclusive leadership of the first Apostles (ch. i.—v.); and into a second section, in which two new elements are added to the persons introduced in the first part and the relations there entered into. These new elements are the Hellenists and Saul, with whose appearance the theatre of action is extended, while the chronology, which was hitherto immediately evident in the succession of the events related, becomes involved (ch. vi.—xii.). In the first place, after the *preface*, the account of the Ascension (i. 3—11), with its announcement (verses 4 sq.), serves as an introduction to ch. i.—v.; just as the completion of the number of the Apostles does to the story of the Pentecost. The latter (ii. 1—42) then follows, and is succeeded by a section (ii. 43—v. 42) respecting the first church, whose peculiar composition is elsewhere described. In the second section (ch. vi.—xii.), the Hellenists step into the arena, the primitive Apostles thereupon retreating at first entirely into the background (cf. vi. 1—4; viii. 1.). First we have Stephen up to the time of his death (vi. 8—vii. 60); then Philip in Samaria (viii. 1—13). Incidentally in these accounts mention is already made of Saul (vii. 58; viii. 1—3). After a temporary appearance of two of the primitive Apostles in Samaria (viii. 14—25), the travels of Philip are continued (viii. 20—40), and the conversion of Saul and the commencement of his career as an Apostle are related (ix. 1—30). The following section again relates to Peter, his miracles (ix. 31—43), and his baptism of Cornelius (x. 1—xi. 18). Thereupon the Hellenists again make their appearance. Along with them, however, in Antioch, we find Barnabas and Saul again (xi. 19—~~20~~). A journey of the two latter brings us once more to Jerusalem (xi. 27—30); and then follows the account of another persecution of the primitive church (xii. 1—23). A general notice of the situation of the Jerusalem Christians, and the announcement of the return of Barnabas and Saul to Antioch (xii. 24, 25), bring this narrative to a conclusion.

The above outline shows that even externally the three elements constituting the narrative from ch. vi. to ch. xii.—viz. (1) the primitive congregation under the first Apostles, particularly Peter; (2) Stephen and the Hellenists; and (3) Paul—are not left without any connection. But what the inner thread is by which their externally artificial connection is held together can only be made apparent upon deeper investigation (*vide* § 1 b).

Distributed over this entire first part of the Acts we find four considerable speeches by the principal personages. Two of them are discourses on doctrine by Peter—the first being placed at the very commencement of the labours of the Apostles as such, and transferred to the day of Pentecost (ii. 14—36); while the second is incorporated in the section respecting the earliest fortunes of the primitive Church (iii. 11—26). Then comes a discourse of Stephen (vii. 1—53), prefixed immediately to the important event when the preaching of the Christian Messiah first extended beyond Jerusalem—an event with which that discourse is directly and characteristically connected by its subject. And, finally, there is an apologetic discourse of Peter (xi. 5—17), belonging to the episode forming the subject of chapter x.

The purely Pauline portion of the Acts (ch. xiii.—xxviii.) also falls into two leading groups of narratives. The first of these relates to the apostolic journeys of Paul (xiii. 1—xxi. 16), while the other concerns his trial and his imprisonment in Jerusalem, Cæsarea and Rome (xxi. 17—xxviii. 31), both groups being also externally interwoven with each other by the passage, xix. 21, and by the announcements in xx. 23 and xxi. 4, 11 et sq. The fundamental scheme according to which the narrative from xiii. 1 to xxi. 16 has been composed, is stated elsewhere. The narrative from xxi. 17 to xxviii. 13 also falls into three principal sections, marked by the commencement of new portions of the story. The first of these (xxi. 17—xxiv. 27) gives an account of the origin and course of the trial of Paul under the procuracy of Felix; the second reports the further progress of the action under Festus, up to the point where it was determined to remove it to

Rome ; and the third (xxvii. 1—xxviii. 31) describes the removal of Paul to Rome, and his appearance in that city as an Apostle. Respecting the parallelism of the arrangement of the first and second of these sections, and respecting the distribution of the speeches of Paul in these sections, the reader is referred to the commentary.

The historical materials of the book are arranged in chronological succession, but without chronological reckoning. Days are frequently enumerated, years seldom ; and points of coincidence with external events are assigned only accidentally and unintentionally. The Feast of the Pentecost after Christ's resurrection and ascension<sup>1</sup> forms the starting-point. From this event to the death of Agrippa I. (A.D. 44), a considerable period elapses, within which the writer has omitted to indicate dates even for the most important events—as, for instance, for the conversion of Paul. After this period comes the commencement of Paul's activity in making conversions, and for the chronology of this period the author has likewise done little (xviii. 11 ; xix. 10 ; xx. 6). The expulsion of the Jews from Rome under Claudius (xviii. 1), A.D. 48—54, is an uncertain point of support. For the history of the imprisonment of Paul there are likewise few chronological data (xxiv. 27 ; xxvii. 9 ; xxviii. 11). But in the last two years of the administration of Felix (xxiv. 27), A.D. 58, 59, or 59, 60, and in the accession of Festus (xxv. 1), A.D. 60 or 61, we have tolerably definite data.

For the chronological aspects of the narrative of the Acts, the fact, correctly pointed out by De Wette, that the purpose of the writer was never immediately addressed to chronology, is especially characteristic. At all events, absolute chronology is entirely neglected by him. Hence the assignment of a date in Luke iii. 1 sq. is not paralleled by a single instance of the same kind in the Acts, probably because to the author's mind the statement in

<sup>1</sup> This was in the year 35 A.D. according to Keim ; in the year 33 according to Euseb. Usseb. Calvis. ; 32 according to Jerome, Baronius, Süsskind and Eichhorn ; 31 according to Petavius and Anger ; 30 according to Wieseler ; 29 according to Ideeler.

that passage represented the fixed chronological starting-point for his entire narrative. Relative chronology, on the other hand, is not indicated throughout, and is composed of very varied elements. Statements like those in xviii. 11; xix. 8, 10; xx. 3; xxiv. 27; and xxviii. 30, appearing generally only in the Pauline portion of the book, stand there also without mutual reference. The remaining chronological details of the narrative, so far as they are not entirely accidental (as, e.g. ii. 1—5, 32), or, so far as they are not explained by the sources of the book (in the sections discussed in § 2 a), rest either on mythical suppositions (i. 3), or also, no doubt, serve certain special aims of the narrative (cf. e.g. xxiv. 1, 11; xxv. 1; xxviii. 17). Such aims also afford an explanation of the chronological arrangement, especially of the transitional section (ch. vi.—xii.). Of an intentional straining of the true chronology of events, we have an example at least in ix. 19 sqq., and perhaps also in the Pauline portions of the narrative in ix. 1—xv. 1 generally, in so far as it is hardly matter of accident that the reader can gather no suspicion of the considerable space of time covered by the events there recounted, and extending, according to Gal. ii. 1, over a period of seventeen years. Hence it follows as a matter of course, that every attempt to draw up the narrative of the Acts under a complete chronological system is not simply hopeless, but even does violence to the nature of this narrative, and imposes on it a burden foreign to the whole drift of it. This fact is entirely misconceived in Wieseler's principal work bearing upon this subject. Against the ground he takes up, the observations of Baur should be compared,—(in opposition to certain glosses and other exegetical attempts of Wieseler we have spoken in the Commentary). Lehmann's dissertation on the chronological determination of the events related in the Acts of the Apostles also misses the mark, the fundamental assumption there that Felix was recalled in the year 58 being incapable of proof, while the arrangement of the events in ch. xiii.—xxviii. rests in part on exceedingly arbitrary modes of filling up the chronological lacuna.

1b.—STANDPOINT AND AIM OF THE BOOK.<sup>1</sup>

Recent attempts to explain the principal problems of the Acts of the Apostles, and the peculiar limitation of its contents in particular, fall into two leading groups. The first of these seeks the solution of the problems in question primarily in the external position of the author with regard to the events, but likewise also in the sources of his book, in their number, nature and mode of employment; while according to the other group, the contents of the book are understood principally by its aim. The first method in its older form, as found in the "Catholic Fathers" (vide *Credner*, Einl. pp. 283 sqq.), has been long abandoned, and after having been carried to its logical consequences, as it has been in modern fashion by Schleiermacher (*Einl.* pp. 343 sqq.) and Schwanbeck (*Ueber die Quellen der A. G.*, Darmst. 1847), and according to which the Acts is made to appear as an accidental compilation from more ancient literary sources, this first method has abolished itself, and may now be regarded as obsolete. Such a view of the book, indeed, allows no room for what was above (p. 8) proved respecting the art displayed in its external arrangement; but interpreters in general are now agreed that at the foundation of the Acts there lies a literary plan, embodying a certain aim.<sup>2</sup> Recently, however, a dispute has been going on partly to determine the aim of the book, and partly in reference to the question as to the influence this aim has exercised upon the historical facts. The two things, however, must be kept asunder; for to the injury of the cause they are only too often confounded with one another. The question whether the Acts has a purely historical aim does not coincide

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Schneckenburger* on the Aim of the Acts of the Apostles; Berne, 1841. *Zeller*, The Acts of the Apostles critically investigated according to its Contents and Origin; *Lekebusch*, The Composition and Origin of the Acts of the Apostles investigated anew; Gotha, 1854.

<sup>2</sup> From this standpoint the question as to the sources of the Acts has recently at times been treated,—and that, too, by apologetical interpreters,—in a purely negative manner (cf. e.g. *Lekebusch*, pp. 402 sqq.); nay, they have even gone to the extent of completely ignoring it (*Baumgarten*).

immediately with that as to its material credibility. If the latter be for the moment left undecided (see § 3 on this question), and the first question be considered by itself, then the view that the Acts has a purely historical aim, i. e. that it narrates the facts it contains for their own sake, must also be described as now discarded. Passing over in this place all more general considerations of a contrary nature derived from the character of the times of the primitive Church, we may, in proof of this statement, simply adduce the defence which the view in question still continues to enjoy. Since the older descriptions of the aim of the historical narrative of the Acts—e. g. that it is an ecclesiastical history of the Apostolic Age, a history of the Pauline Church, a history of Christian Missions, a history of Peter and Paul, and so on—since these descriptions have been generally recognized as incompatible with the contents of the book, the most recent champions<sup>1</sup> of this view no longer find themselves in a position to state the theme of the Acts, except in the most colourless manner and in entire disregard of the concrete contents of the book.<sup>2</sup> Hence, too, they are unable to carry through their own view of the Acts, in the face of the several peculiarities of its contents, otherwise than by help of a series of the most arbitrary assumptions to which they are compelled to have recourse—such, for instance, as the ignorance of Luke, the condition of his sources, his intention to write a continuation of the Acts of the Apostles, the requirements of the first readers, especially of Theophilus, and so on. The element which lends utility to these assumptions, from the point of view occupied by this class of commentators—we mean their elastic and indefinite character—is precisely that which establishes their scientific worthlessness. The measure of the author's knowledge of the

<sup>1</sup> Meyer, pp. 8 sqq.; Bleek, Einl. pp. 324 sqq.; Ewald, Gesch. d. Volk. Isr. vi. 28; Hackett, pp. 19 sqq., and others.

<sup>2</sup> According to Bleek, for example, the object of the Acts of the Apostles is (after the author's Gospel) "to furnish a connected account, as trustworthy as possible, respecting the further progress of the work commenced by the Saviour in his labours upon earth."

events of the time he depicts, the nature of his sources, &c.—these are questions which themselves first require to be subjected to methodical investigation; nor, again, can general assumptions on such points, being nothing more than expedients adopted of necessity, be legitimately applied forthwith to other questions, even granting,—on the supposition especially of the Acts having been written by a disciple of the Apostles,—that the parity of the contents of his book with his knowledge, and therefore the general application of this category, were not a sheer impossibility. The hypothesis of an intended continuation of the Acts is a mere invention. To explain the problem of the contents of the Acts by the requirements of the readers of the book, and especially of Theophilus, is to enlighten our darkness with darkness,<sup>1</sup> an *ignotum per ignotius*. Indeed, as a matter of fact, even the majority of the apologists stand in a different position in reference to the question concerning the aim of the Acts, when they acknowledge that the historical facts of the book are subordinated to a higher point of view that is not immediately obvious in the facts themselves; and, taking the passage i. 8 as their basis, they mostly declare the *spread of the Gospel from Jerusalem to Rome*,<sup>2</sup> or *from the Jews to the Gentiles*,<sup>3</sup> to have been the fundamental thought determining the contents of the Acts. But although in regard to these conclusions it cannot be disputed that they are based upon a deeper investigation into the details of the contents of the Acts, they remain, nevertheless, still of so general a character as compared with the contents themselves, that they convert the narrative into a pure

<sup>1</sup> In opposition to this entire point of view, compare Schneckenburger, pp. 45 sqq.; Zeller, pp. 337 sqq. These commentators are very fond of quoting Luke i. 1—4 in favour of the purely historical aim of the Acts. But the prologue of Luke's Gospel, even if the circumstances of the reference there were different from what has been maintained above (p. 6), could not in any case establish such a prejudice in the question as to the aim of the Acts—a question which is by no means to be decided in so cheap and superficial a manner (cf. Zeller).

<sup>2</sup> Mayerhoff, Einl. in die petrin. Schriften, p. 5; Lekebusch, pp. 209 sqq.; Baumgarten, Klostermann, pp. 63 sqq.; Trip, pp. 33, 64 sqq.; Oertel, p. 68, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Ebrard on Olshausen, p. 318.

allegory. In particular, as regards the view that the Acts is intended to describe the passage of the Gospel from Jerusalem to Rome, this collapses at once before the fact that in ch. xxviii. v. 15, the Acts presupposes the existence of a Christian community in Rome without having announced its origination,<sup>1</sup> and that it does not relate how the Gospel, but how Paul, went to Rome. With this observation, however, the chief objection to the last-mentioned conclusions respecting the point of view under which the facts contained in the Acts are drawn up, is stated.<sup>2</sup> Those conclusions overlook the personal relation of the Acts to Paul, without the assumption of which all the numerous features belonging to the personal characteristics of the Apostle must remain inexplicable; as, for example, the thrice-told narrative of his conversion, the notices respecting his labours as a pious Jew, his travelling companions, and the attitude of the Gentile and particularly of the Roman authorities to him, and, above all, the detailed account of his trial, xxi. 17 sqq. It is only, as it were, the reverse of the medal that from this standpoint the limitation of the characteristics of the Apostle in the Acts, or the omissions in the picture which the book presents of Paul, cannot at all be understood in their own special peculiarity. That the Acts of the Apostles is not a biography of Paul is in the present day acknowledged. On the other hand, however, it is clear that in this respect the narrative is at any rate not so impersonal as that its subject should be the spread of the Gospel from Jerusalem to Rome or from the Jews to the Gentiles,<sup>3</sup> and that the personal interest in Paul is absolutely subor-

<sup>1</sup> *Schneckenburger*, p. 48; *Bleek*, p. 323.

<sup>2</sup> For the sake of brevity, what follows is addressed exclusively to the Pauline part of the Acts, and the proof of the impossibility of explaining this portion of the book from the standpoint of those conclusions suffices to refute them, even if we should not be disposed to adhere to *Schneckenburger's* just observations (pp. 49 sqq.) respecting the particular importance of the second portion of the Acts for the determination of its aim; observations whose significance, however, we may in no case exaggerate, as, we may remark by the way, they have been in the dissertation by *Aberle*.

<sup>3</sup> As seems to be held, especially by *Ebrard*, loc. cit.

dinated to its course of development<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the defec-tiveness of the narrative as regards Paul is nevertheless surprising, and demands special explanation, since the general position that the Acts shows no independent interest at all in the person of Paul by no means suffices to settle the question.

Thus far it has already been established generally that the narrative of the Acts cannot be comprehended without reference to the antagonisms of primitive Christianity, and without the supposition of a Pauline-apologetic bias ; and this element, commentators of the class just combatted have of late been constrained to take into consideration in determining the aim of the Acts (vide Klostermann, pp 63 sqq.). De Wette also, following Schneckenburger, was of opinion that the practical point of view occupied by the historical narrative was a Pauline-apologetic one, "that is, in opposition to the narrow-hearted views of the Jewish Christians, the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles, and its reception by them without imposing on them the Mosaic law as though it were commanded by Christ and God and approved by all the Apostles ; and further, the labours, doctrine and proceedings of Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles—these things are all described in such a way that this Apostle, whom the strict Jews and Jewish Christians regarded as an enemy of the law and seducer of the people, appears as a messenger of the faith, called by Christ and the Holy Spirit himself, and recognized by the other Apostles, and further as a friend of the Jewish nation and faithful observer of the law." Disregarding for the moment the limitations under which alone De Wette thinks himself justified in accepting even this description of the aim of the Acts, the first question nevertheless is, What becomes of the representation, here presupposed, that the book was designed for the Judaists ? and generally, What position does the book occupy, with its Pauline-apologetic bias, to the opposed elements of Paulinism and Judaism ? According to Schnecken-

<sup>1</sup> On this point we reserve the correct remarks of Zeller (p. 344) respecting the interest manifested in the Acts in the persons of the Apostles.

burger (pp. 221 sqq.), the Acts was intended exclusively for the *Anti-Pauline Judaists*. In opposition to this theory, most critics who favour the view that the book has a certain design, maintain that the work is addressed to both parties in primitive Christendom, to Jewish and to Gentile Christians (Judaists and Paulinists), and that it possesses, not so much an apologetic, as (from the Pauline standpoint) a *conciliatory* aim.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the Acts would be, "the draft of a proposal for peace presented to the Judaists by the Pauline party" (Zeller, p. 358)—a proposal of a nature which "was intended to purchase the recognition of the Gentile Christians by the Jewish Christians by means of concessions to Judaism, and designed to act upon both parties in this sense."<sup>2</sup> With Zeller,—whose examination of the subject, as being the most thorough, we may here make the basis of our remarks,—the proof of this conception of the Acts depends chiefly upon ch. xv., especially upon the decree of the Apostles (pp. 357 sqq.), and on the consideration that the views occurring in the Acts cannot in any case have been those generally prevailing at the time in Pauline circles, and, so far, can only be regarded as concessions to the Judaists, concessions to which the writer also desired to win over his own party (pp. 359 sqq.). This refers especially to the continuance of the obligation of the Jewish Christians to observe the Law which is implied in the Apostles' decree (xv. 23 sqq.; cf. xxi. 21 sqq.). It is at all events quite impossible that this should ever have been a prevailing opinion among the Pauline Gentile Christians, since from the middle of the second century, the demand that the Jewish Christians should be absolutely bound to observe the Law, and in particular to submit to circumcision, had ceased to be made even by strict Anti-Paulinists (e.g. in the Clementines); nor has Justin any trace of such a concession to Judaism (vide Dial. c. Tryph.

<sup>1</sup> *Baur*, Ursprung des Episc. p. 142; *Paul*, pp. 11 sqq. (i. 15 sqq.); *Schwegler*, Nachapostol. Zeitalt. II. 73 sqq.; *Zeller*, pp. 351 sqq.; *Reuss*, loc. cit. § 210; and on the apologetic standpoint also even *Thiersch*, Apost. Zeitalt. p. 117.

<sup>2</sup> *Zeller*, p. 363; cf. *Baur*, Christenth. der drei erst. Jahrh. p. 128.

c. 47). In fact, all that we know of the development of the ancient Catholic Church makes such a concession on the part of the Pauline Christians appear incomprehensible; at all events, this point cannot be settled by mere chronological hypotheses, as is attempted by Zeller (pp. 478 sqq.). So much the more, however, does the question force itself upon us, whether the subjection of the Jewish Christians to the Law, as assumed in the Acts, can be regarded as a concession (cf. also Schwegler, p. 122), and whether the apostolic decree can in any case be contemplated as a proposal for a compromise, suggested by the author of the Acts. Of those provisions in the decree that relate to the Gentile Christians, this cannot be asserted so far as they are traceable to dispositions which were not made by the author, but which must have been found by him already in existence. But further, as regards the supposition made in the decree respecting the Jewish Christians, the writer's own narrative gives us occasion to doubt whether it is intended by him as a proposal for a compromise. If we keep for a moment to the text of the Acts, then, apart from the special reference of the narrative to the Epistle to the Galatians, the effect of the dispositions made in the decree, and in particular of the above-mentioned supposition relative to the Christians who were born as Jews, might possibly reveal itself in the story contained in the passage, xxi. 17—26; that is, the author would by no means have the obligation of the Jewish Christians to observe the Law, regarded as a proposal for a compromise for his own times; but in the spirit of his representation of Paul, he intended to lay this down as a rule of general validity in the apostolic age, and to express himself to the effect that Paul could not have been a despiser of the Law, on account of the fundamental compact then existing which bound him as a Jew to the Law, and which compact he himself recognized. But that which almost compels us to give this and no other interpretation to the obligation of the Jewish Christians under the decree, is the fact that the author of the Acts is not simply conscious of a higher point of view,—for this is necessa-

rily presupposed by the conciliatory interpretation of the decree,—but that he pointedly gives expression to it in ch. xiii. verses 38 sqq., and especially in the discourse of Peter in xv. 7 sqq. According to these passages, it must, so far as the Acts of the Apostles is concerned, have been a settled point that absolute obligation to observe the Law no longer existed in the Christian community, and therefore could not have been in force amongst the Jewish Christians; and although, for a particular purpose, the author sacrifices this principle as regards the apostolic age, yet he cannot have had the intention of setting it up as a permanent and absolute rule.<sup>1</sup> If in this sense we limit the purport of the apostolic decree, then in the Acts there are no views which stand so isolated in the Gentile Christianity of post-apostolic times as to permit us to impute to the decree the design to effect a change in the sentiments of the Gentile Christians in favour of Judaism. But to regard the Acts as a conciliatory work aggravates the difficulty of the assumption that the book was designed for Judaists—at least if by the latter we understand Christians who were of Jewish parentage. Against this view we have the *national Anti-Judaism* of the Acts, its antagonism to the Jews as a nation<sup>2</sup> This book, which un-

<sup>1</sup> This of course is intended to convey something entirely different from the view of the apologists, which is completely untenable on exegetical grounds, that the regulations in the apostolic decree might be regarded as already abolished within the apostolic age. That the decree of the Apostles was intended to make simply provisional regulations cannot at all have been the opinion of the author of the Acts; and that of these regulations, that supposed to be intended for the Jews should in point of fact have been only provisional, is a matter he never thought of. With the passage, xv. 10, the decree no doubt stands in contradiction; but, precisely on this account, it is also not, when considered simply by itself, the author's own opinion, but serves as a means to his object, the Judaization of Paul. The Acts no doubt occupies ground upon which the obligatory force of the Law no longer possesses absolute validity; but this position, as contrasted with the old Pauline standpoint, is already so weakened, and so far from being firmly maintained in principle, that it is possible for the author to represent Paul and the Jewish Christians of the past (apostolic) age in general as subject to the Law.

<sup>2</sup> Against the view of the Acts at present prevailing among critical theologians, Lekebusch (pp. 369 sqq.) has already made some sound objections of a similar character. When, moreover, Zeller, in favour of the significance which he attributes to the story of the council of the Apostles in relation to the principal aim of the Act-

equivocally attributes the development of the Christian community to the stubborn unbelief of the Jews, which from the outset pointedly emphasizes their past culpability, and which as a matter of fact charges upon the Jews every additional advance made in the preaching of the Christian Messiah,—cf. the main drift of ch. i. to xii., especially the discourse of Stephen, ch. vii.; further, the account of Paul's mode of dealing with the Jews on his journeys,—this book, which, moreover, betrays a zealous endeavour to separate the cause of the Christians externally from that of the Jews (vide ch. xviii. 11 sqq.; xix. 33 sqq., and generally the further remarks below on the political aspects of the Acts),—a book which in this sense estranges Paul himself from his own nation,—such a book cannot have been intended to exercise a conciliatory influence upon the Jewish Christians.<sup>1</sup> On the contrary, nothing can be more evident than that the Acts gives up Jewish Christianity as such, and is written from a point of view before which Gentile Christianity presented itself as the completely predominant element in the Church.<sup>2</sup> Hence it follows that the Acts cannot be understood as a work putting itself between the primitive Christian parties, those namely of the old apostolic Jewish Christianity and of the Pauline Gentile Christianity respectively. *Its* Gentile Christianity no doubt is not that of Paul; but still less is its Judaism of the

appeals also to the central position occupied by this story in the book (p. 357), we have to remark that this position can likewise be otherwise accounted for from the composition of the Acts.

<sup>1</sup> On this point the Acts is allied, as regards the form of expression, with the fourth Gospel (cf. *Baur*, *Kanon. Evv.* pp. 317 sqq.); and the observations referring to the frigid lack of development characterizing the leading historical antitheses in the narrative of the fourth Gospel (vide *Baur*, pp. 283 sqq.) may also be applied to the Acts of the Apostles.

<sup>2</sup> This is in decided contradiction to *Schwegler*, II. 122 sqq., who makes the Acts to have been written at a time when “the Jewish Christians, the baptized Hellenists, also had the numerical preponderance in the Church,” and the “born Gentiles” first began to flow in in large numbers. But the existence of this relative proportion among the nationalities within the Church may be doubted even as regards the apostolic age (cf. *Romans*, ch. ix.—xi.). To prove, however, the high development of the Gentile Christian consciousness under which the Acts is written, nothing more is required than its concluding narrative (xxviii. 17—31).

old apostolic sort ; and what there is Judaistic in the book may be explained by the intention it manifests of placing itself on the ground occupied by the original and proper Jewish Christianity. Rather must the Judaistic element in the Acts have been already a component part of the Gentile Christianity, which the book itself vindicates ; nor is the work a proposal of peace between those primitive Christian parties, but the attempt on the part of a Gentile Christianity, itself already strongly influenced by the old Christian Judaism, to clear up its position with regard to the past, and in particular with regard to its own origin and its first founder, Paul. Certainly the Acts has given up the essential features of Paulinism with the single exception of its Universalism (Zeller, pp. 353 sqq.);<sup>1</sup> but it has done this not in the sense of a concession to a party standing outside its own circles, but in the spirit of the view taken by Paul, a view which,—in consequence of Judaistic influence, active as it was from the outset, and in consequence of the natural incapacity of Gentile Christianity to comprehend and strictly to hold fast by the problems of the original Paulinism,—spread likewise among Gentile Christians and completely swayed the old Catholic Church in general.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This holds good notwithstanding the passages, xiii. 38; xv. 7 sqq., already acknowledged as characteristic for the Acts. For upon the Pauline view of the Old Testament Law which betrays itself here, Christian Universalism in the Acts of the Apostles is never founded. The Pauline *antinomism* or hostility to the Law has in the Acts lost all importance as a principle in this sense, and the book completely dissolves the close connection which subsists between the Antinomism and Universalism of Paul, so that Gentile Christianity now depends in principle upon miraculous commands and revelations (i. 8; viii. 26 sqq.; ix. 15 sqq.; x. i. sqq.; xvi. 9; xviii. 10; xxii. 12 sqq., 17 sqq.; xxiii. 11; xxvi. 15 sqq.), and in point of fact practically upon the unbelief of the Jews.

<sup>2</sup> This mode of viewing the Acts at any rate seeks the basis of the historical narrative more internally in the standpoint of the author, and endeavours to derive it less exclusively from its practical aims than is the case with Zeller ; but the intention in these remarks is by no means to deny the existence of a biased attitude in the book as regards historical facts. It must be unconditionally conceded to Zeller (pp. 352 sqq.) that more especially the representation of Paul in the Acts too deeply and characteristically modifies the historical tradition which, as we must assume, was also known to the author, to be understood simply as originating in a defective view of the Apostle of the Gentiles. Moreover, even if the isolation of the peculiar Gentile

While, however, the Acts is decidedly averse to everything of a national Jewish character, and repels it, yet it is at all events not written without regard for the Gentiles, and particularly for the Romans and their Commonwealth—a fact which likewise appears to presuppose a certain internal consolidation of the Christian community at the time of the composition of the book. In connection herewith we may bring the general habit which runs through the entire book of contrasting Jewish unbelief with Gentile belief. But far more exclusively to this head belongs that which we may call the *political side* of the Acts—its obvious striving to procure for the Christian cause the favour of the State authorities of Rome by the consistent representation of the good terms on which the personages of the Apostolic period, particularly Paul, stood with the Roman state and its officers (cf. Schneckenburger, pp. 244 sqq.; Zeller, pp. 365 sqq.). The earliest among the Gentiles converted by Peter and Paul are Roman officials (x. 1 sqq.; xiii. 7 sqq.; cf. also xxviii. 7 sqq.). The groundlessness of the political accusations against the Apostle of the Gentiles is repeatedly urged; the authorities are constantly proffering him their protection (xviii. 12 sqq.; xix. 35 sqq.); or, at all events, if they have unwittingly shown him any want of respect, they recognize his claim which as a Roman citizen he has to their protection, in the most decided manner (xvi. 37 sqq.; xxii. 22 sqq.). Especially does the trial of Paul give the Roman officials the opportunity of showing the favourable opinion they have of him; and, shielded by the Roman laws, he is enabled,

Christianity in the Acts assumed by Zeller is disputed, it is by no means maintained by the foregoing remarks that the views in the Acts exclusively ruled the Gentile Christianity of the time. Against this an objection might be raised, at least on the part of the Gnostics; while Justin, on the other hand, appears to represent a Gentile Christianity which is still more estranged from Paul than we find in the *Acta*. The latter is at any rate a mediating work, but not of such a character that, out of two given and mutually wholly exclusive standpoints, it constructs a third; but the question of principle in the apostolic age—the position of believers in regard to the Law—has already lost its sharpness and exclusive importance so far as concerns the *Acta*, and in having addressed itself in the main, only to Gentile Christians, the book is not so foreign to the circles which it is intended to influence as would be especially the case under the assumption that it was designed for Jewish Christians.

though still a prisoner, joyfully for a considerable time to fulfil in Rome his duties as an Apostle (xxviii. 30, 31). Nay, the long detention of the Apostle is in part explained simply by forgetfulness of duty on the part of certain officials (xxiv. 26 sq.; xxv. 9). In this account, to which the experience of Paul can hardly have corresponded,<sup>1</sup> we cannot fail to recognize the design to avert political suspicions from Christianity, and such an account, in the form presented in the Acts, cannot have been intended for any other address than the Gentiles outside the Church.<sup>2</sup>

Apart from this subordinate political aim,<sup>3</sup> the Acts is the work of a Gentile Christian, who, without having completely abandoned the principles contained in Paulinism, with strictness only holds fast by the fact of the existence of a Gentile Christianity originated by Paul, but no longer recognizes its ideal basis in the Pauline Gospel, but finds for it another explanation, which makes Gentile Christianity appear not as having been originally founded by Paul, when he broke through the barriers of the primitive Church, but as the legitimate fruit

<sup>1</sup> In favour of this, the passage 2 Cor. xi. 25 cannot be forthwith quoted without further remark, in so far as by this passage the possibility is not excluded that the conflicts of Paul with the civil power, which are presupposed, all terminated badly only in consequence of oversights or of mere official caprice. The question only is whether such a suggestion is probable generally.

<sup>2</sup> This is also assumed by Zeller, p. 368, although he holds Schneckenburger's opinion (pp. 244 sqq.) as not improbable, that is, that the political purification of Paul is in the Acts designed for the Jewish Christians. It is, however, difficult to discover clearly in what manner a tranquillizing effect could be produced on the Jews, as Schneckenburger imagines, by a representation which, at the same time, in Paul's conflicts with the Jews, makes the Roman authorities regularly either appear in principle on his side, or take his part entirely (xviii. 12 sqq.; xxi. 31 sqq., xxii. 22 sqq.; xxiv. 22 sq.; xxv. 9, 10, 18 sq.); and which, moreover, puts political accusations against Paul only in the mouth of Jews, accusations on the ground of which the latter condemn Gentiles. Whoever designed to produce in the feelings of Anti-Pauline Jewish Christians who held by their connection with Judaism a change in favour of Paul, would hardly have distributed the ways and means to his end in this manner.

<sup>3</sup> The political aspects of the Acts are viewed with one-sided exaggeration in the generally wild assumptions of Aberle and of Ebrard (on Olshausen, pp. 318 sq.), according to which the Acts would be a record intended to be applied in Paul's trial in defence of the accused. And in particular the one-sided stress which Aberle lays upon the narrative in ch. xxi.—xxviii. is a caricature of the real facts. Against him see also Hilgenfeld.

of the old Apostolic Christianity. The exposition of this uninterrupted course of development is presented by the preliminary history in ch. i.—xii., in which all the essential elements generally dominating the narrative of the Acts are already found applied (cf. with the following outline, Zeller, pp. 376 sqq.).

Universality of design is attributed to the Christian Church from its first institution (i. 8 ; ii. 1 sqq.), and is already prophetically urged by Peter, its first head, in his apostolic discourses on doctrine before the Jews at Jerusalem (ii. 39 ; iii. 26). This universality then advances nearer to its realization through the manifestation of Jewish unbelief, which betrays itself more and more clearly in two persecutions of the original Church, then flourishing in inward happiness (ii. 43—v. 42). It is precisely this unbelief which, after the first martyr has fallen a victim to it, drives a (detached, vi. 1) portion of the primitive Church out of Jerusalem (vi. 1—viii. 3), and leads (viii. 4—40) to the first preaching of the Messiah in semi-Gentile circles by the Hellenists under the patronage of the privileged first Apostles (viii. 14—25). Paul, a particularly strict Jew in respect to religion (vii. 58 ; viii. 1, 3 ; cf. with xxii. 3 sqq., 19 sq. ; xxvi. 9 sqq.), is brought from the midst of his indignant zeal against the Christians, by a splendid miracle, to the acknowledgment of their Messiah (ix. 1—9); and, through the mediation of a pious Jewish Christian (just as the original Apostles, i. 8), is called (ix. 10—19) to the universal Apostleship (ix. 15)—a vocation which later revelations repeatedly confirm (xvi. 9 ; xviii. 10 ; xxii. 18 sq. ; xxiii. 11). He preaches the Messiahship of Jesus at first only amongst Jews, even as did the first Apostles, with whom he soon enters into the most intimate relations, till Jewish hatred compels him also to take to flight (ix. 19—30). At this point, Peter, the exalted miracle-working head of the primitive Church (ix. 31—43), receives authority to perform the baptism of the first Gentile (x. 1—xi. 18), whereupon the Hellenists also, but again in this instance not without obtaining the assent of the primitive Church, found the first Gentile Christian congregation, in which

Paul too, under the patronage, which he had previously received, of Barnabas, a respected member of the primitive Church, appears as an Apostle (xi. 19—26). At the time when Paul again finds an opportunity of renewing his relations with the primitive Church, through a commission he receives from the Church at Antioch, a new persecution breaks out at Jerusalem, by which the irreceptivity of the Jews for the new revelation is again manifested (xi. 27—xii. 25). With this—and here commences the second part of the Acts of the Apostles—the road is opened for the labours of Paul in the countries of the Gentiles (xiii. 1—xxi. 16). Sanctioned in this undertaking by the precedent of Peter, he shows himself, by his miracles and his full share in the Apostolic prerogative of the communication of the Spirit (xix. 1 sqq.), as fully ranking among the Apostles. But he remains without change faithfully devoted to the pious customs of the Jews. Nor, when on his journeys, does he forget Jerusalem, for thrice he interrupts them in order to visit the holy city—hence the three groups in which the Pauline journeys are introduced. Before he appears quite independently as an Apostle among the Gentiles, he once more obtains the sanction of the primitive Church (xv. 1—33), and by his converse with others, by exact fulfilment of the Law, to which he considers himself bound,—including under the obligation, indeed, not simply himself as a Jew (xviii. 18 sq.; xx. 16; and generally xv. 23 sq., cf. with xxi. 17 sqq.), but also a non-Jewish companion,—and further, by an invariable recognition of the religious privileges of his Jewish associates, he evinces the strictness of his orthodoxy. Nevertheless, on this ground too, he is steadily pursued by the disbelief and hatred of the nation predestined by God for the kingdom of the Messiah: nor do the Gentiles, to whom he is driven by that unbelief, by any means all side with him (xvii. 16—33). Indeed, amongst them also he has to suffer various hardships (xvi. 16—40; xix. 23—41); yet the faith which he at the same time finds among them (xiv. 1; xvi. 29; xvii. 4, 12, 24, 34; xviii. 4; xix. 10, 17, 26), and which in many cases

stood in contrast to Jewish unbelief (xiii. 6 sqq. 48; xiv. 11 sqq.; xviii. 8 sq., cf. xxviii. 30), proves that there is also a career appointed for the kingdom of the Messiah among the Gentiles (xiii. 48). Indeed, against Jewish persecution Paul finds the most effective protection amongst the Gentiles (vide the passages *supra*, pp. 23, 24), with whom generally by his birth (ix. 11; xxi. 39; xxii. 3; xxiii. 34), and his belonging to the Roman State (xvi. 37 sqq.; xxii. 25 sqq.; xxiii. 27; xxv. 10 sq.), he already has personal relations.<sup>1</sup> This position of Paul in relation to the primitive Church, and to the Jews and Gentiles, finally manifests itself (xxi. 17—xxviii. 31) in the most evident manner, in a trial which Jewish hatred has brought on him, but which, so far as Palestine is concerned, closes with his complete acquittal (xxvi. 31 sq.), and enables him for two years further to occupy himself with his office as Apostle of the Jews and Gentiles in Rome (xxviii. 30 sq.).

This narrative is so complete in itself, and so characteristic, that it is almost perfectly intelligible without extrinsic assistance. Its peculiarity and its aim, however, do not wholly reveal themselves until a detailed comparison has been made with the Pauline Epistles. The point here in question is not the defectiveness of the narrative of the Acts *in general*, though this also results from the Pauline Epistles (cf. especially 2 Cor. xi. 24

<sup>1</sup> In order to understand the middle position which the Acts assigns to Paul between Judaism and Gentilism, and the peculiar detachment of the Apostle from Judaism connected therewith, and correctly to harmonize these features, especially with the Judaizement of Paul in the Acts, we must distinguish what elements in this representation the author of the Acts was conscious of and what he was unconscious of. Among the intentional elements is the weight he lays on the personal relations, just described, of Paul to the Gentiles; but that, in doing this, he estranges the Apostle from his own nation—that he attributes to him, even as a teacher, views which weaken the antithesis between him and Gentilism—these things happen involuntarily, and do not contradict the Judaizement of the Apostle, which has otherwise been observed throughout, because in the views in question the author finds the measure of Judaism as it presented itself to him, and generally to the Gentile Christians of the ancient Church—not the measure of the real historical Judaism, and still less that of Judaism as Paul understood it. The most characteristic example of unconscious contradiction with Paul's fundamental religious views, rooted as they are in Judaism, is the speech at Athens, xvii. 22 sqq.

sqq.)—for, measured by a standard of a biography of Paul, this defectiveness follows entirely of itself, and reveals itself indeed as being of extraordinary dimensions—the point is, the characteristic relation subsisting between the historical contents of these Epistles and of the Acts. In the first place, it is surprising that the interest attaching to the Acts is not that which belongs specially to Paul's work as an Apostle, and to which we are introduced by his Epistles. The outward (geographical) compass of the apostolic journeys of Paul, and the outward success he had upon them, are the principal objects of attention in the Acts; indeed, that period in the Apostle's life which is described in xxiv. 27 and xxviii. 30, and which extended over several years, is in a certain sense devoid of any independent interest for the Acts; for that which here forms the principal subject of the narrative—the course of Paul's trial—is only designed to throw the right light on the rest of his work as an Apostle. The more inward side of the apostolic life of Paul, everything which he did as a leader and guardian of his already existing congregations, appears only in a very few notices of the most cursory character (xiv. 22 sq.; xvi. 1 sq., 4 sq.; xx. 2 sq., 7 sq.), or in a very few most colourless and commonplace attempts (xix. 8—20; xx. 17—38); and where such light might be particularly looked for (xvi. 6; xviii. 1—18, 23; xx. 2), there it does not appear at all. Only once are we more pointedly reminded of the church-leadership of Paul, but here the narrative comes at once into direct collision with the Pauline Epistles (xv. 1 sqq.). This general relation subsisting between the sources is sufficient of itself to suggest the presumption that the Acts occupies a point of view already in some way very strange to the original Paulinism. The presumption, however, rises to certainty when we at length observe, on closer investigation, that the Acts does not, as we might perhaps imagine, supplement the picture of the Apostle which we gather from the Epistles, but leaves behind on us an entirely contradictory impression. For, in the latter, the peculiar Gospel of Paul is not presupposed but

annihilated—even the single passage which puts in the mouth of Paul a characteristic principle of this Gospel (xiii. 39), is in the book itself anything but peculiarly Pauline (cf. xv. 10). The Apostle of the Gentiles (Gal. i. 16 ; ii. 7) has become a universal Apostle [vide supra, p. 25,—taken in its connection in the Acts, the passage xxii. 20 also forms no exception (cf. shortly before, verse 15)]. And because, apart from the extent to which he had spread the preaching of the Christian Messiah, he has not in the Acts brought the slightest new element of development into the history of the Christian Church, his opponents here are likewise none other than those of the primitive Church, the unbelieving Jews. That, however, in that section of the life of Paul to which his principal Epistles belong, the struggle with Jewish Christianity, formed a leading feature in his work—this is a fact of which there is not simply no trace in the Acts, but which would there even be unintelligible—an assertion which, moreover, the two passages hinting at the existence of opponents of Paul within the Church (xv. 1 sqq. ; xxi. 17 sqq.) can only go entirely to substantiate. Indeed, to Paul's own narrative, which most sharply exhibits his relation to the primitive apostolic Christianity and its Judaistic followers (Gal. i. 11—ii. 21), the Acts presents systematic contradiction (ix. 19—30 ; xv. 1—xvi. 3). And in other respects too the several facts in the life of Paul in which the Acts comes into contact with the Epistles, are in the former placed in a characteristically different light: as, for example, the journeys of the Apostle to Jerusalem; the great collections; and likewise the miraculous conversion of Paul, which in the Acts does not mark his rupture with Judaism, but serves purposes of quite an opposite nature. Such being the position in which the Acts stands with relation to the Pauline Epistles, it will be readily understood that, while we may no doubt occupy ourselves in assigning to the Epistles their respective position in the outer margin of the narrative of the Acts, not a single one of them can be really explained by help of the latter work.

In the foregoing remarks we have already, in the main, replied to De Wette's scruples with regard to the procedure of Schneckenburger, who, following Baur, extends to the entire book of the Acts the explanation of its contents, derived from its aim,—that is to say, as presenting a “justification of Paul against the backbitings of the Judaists.” According to this hypothesis, almost everything in the first part stands parallel to the second part, and, in particular, what Peter does and what he teaches, serves as a pattern and justification for Paul, Peter being represented as Pauline in his views, and Paul as Petrine. But for the sake of this hypothesis, it is “denied, in spite of the clear words of the author, that the Acts is the second part of the Gospel (an assumption under which, moreover, the awkward circumstance always remains that an apology written for Judaists is dedicated to a Gentile Christian like Theophilus).” To this a reply has been given on p. 6, and, likewise, in the design above assigned to the Acts in contradiction to Schneckenburger. In favour of the same hypothesis, it is further urged that “in the first part, that which obviously has a more general significance, like ch. i.—vi. 12, is forced into the apologetic part; and, in the second part, that which does not fit in, like xvii. 16—34; xviii. 24—28, and many isolated items occurring in the middle of the narrative (xiv. 1—7, 20—28; xvi. 5—8, 14 sq.; xviii. 23; xix. 22; xx. 1—6, 13—15; xxi. 1—3, &c. &c.), are passed over in silence; while to other passages, like xix. 23—40; xx. 7—12, a remote or uncertain apologetic aim is attributed (p. 246 sq., 54).” These exceptions, which have, in some cases not altogether without reason, been taken to Schneckenburger, have been rebutted in the preceding remarks, and in the Commentary also, especially in the references there given respecting the composition of the Acts (cf. also, against De Wette, Zeller, pp. 363 sq.). Schneckenburger's explanations of the statements of the Acts, as arising from the above-mentioned aim, appear to De Wette very highly improbable,—“how that Luke threw a veil over most of the persecutions, and even over the martyrdom

of the Apostle, because on account of these things his opponents would have disparaged him (cf. ix. 16; 2 Cor. xi. 23, sq.),”—this is at any rate not the case, in so far as the intention cannot be imputed to the author of the Acts of passing over in silence the sufferings of Paul generally; and his silence respecting the death of the Apostle is at least not accounted for by his having Paul's Judaistic opponents in his eye. Further, “that he passed over the foundation of the Galatian churches, because they were formed entirely by Gentile Christians,” and “that he has said little of the collection of alms, because this would have offered his opponents opportunity for calumny,” &c. &c.,—these statements of the Acts at any rate also belong, according to the above conclusions, to those which are quite characteristic.

#### 2a.—SOURCES OF THE Book. (a) THE ἡμεῖς SECTIONS.<sup>1</sup>

It is certain that the author is the author of the third Gospel, and that his literary peculiarity remains on the whole the same in the two works, and, in the Acts itself, from the beginning to the end (Einl. ins N. T. § 115, Not. h.; *Mayerhoff*, Hist. kr. Einl. in d. petrin. Schriften, Abhandl. ub. d. Vf. d. AG. pp. 23 sqq.; *Zeller*, pp. 414 sqq.). Nor, again, are back references wanting (xi. 16, cf. i. 5; xi. 19, cf. viii. 1; xii. 25, cf. xi. 30; xv. 8, cf. xi. 47; xv. 38, cf. xiii. 13; xvi. 4, cf. xv. 23 sqq.; xviii. 5, cf. xvii. 15; xix. 1, cf. xviii. 23; xxi. 8, cf. vi. 5, viii. 40; xxi. 29, cf. xx. 4; xxii. 20, cf. vii. 58, viii. 1; xxiv. 15, cf. xxiii. 6 (vide De Wette, Einl. § 115 a. Anm. d.). On the other hand, the question from what sources the writer has drawn, and how near or remotely he stood in reference to the history he relates, is the subject of dispute. Since in the passages, xvi. 10—17; xx. 5—15; xxi. 1—18; xxvii. 1—xxviii. 16, an eye-witness, and one who took part in the history, is speaking, there is nothing more natural, considering the obvious uniformity of the work, than that Luke,

<sup>1</sup> A. *Klostermann*, *Vindicatio Lucanae seu de itinerarii in libro Actorum assertione auctore*; Göttingen, 1866.

who is himself named by tradition as the author, should be taken as such—an assumption which Schneckenburger has defended with much industry and skill. But the conclusion arrived at by Mayerhoff, pp. 6 sqq.; Bleek (*Einl. in d. N. T.*; Berlin, 1862, pp. 328 sqq.), and Ulrich, that it is rather Timothy who is the reporter in question, possesses, even according to the hostile remarks of Schneckenburger, Ebrard (*Krit. d. Evang. Gesch.* pp. 904 sqq.) and Rink, a preponderance of probability. [Baur, Paul, p. 12, does not enter at all into this question, contenting himself with finding an error in the fact that the author makes use of the communicative form of discourse in passages in whose connection Luke is mentioned (?).]<sup>1</sup> Timothy, however, cannot be esteemed the author of the entire work (Mayerhoff), for (1) in a writing addressed to a friend (*Theophilus*), he would not have spoken of himself in the way in which obviously a third person speaks of Timothy, as in xvi. 11 sqq.; xix. 22; xx. 4 (cf. note on the last passage). (2) He would not have given the short accounts (xvi. 6—8; xviii. 22 sqq.; xix. 22; xx. 1—3), partly inadequate and partly only half true, belonging to important and successful periods, during some of which he was present with the Apostle and in his service, or, when not, was at any rate in a position enabling him to obtain exact information respecting him—periods, moreover, embracing his return to the Apostle at Athens (cf. 1 Thess. iii. 1 sqq.), and many other similar incidents in Paul's biography which Timothy would not have passed over in silence. (3) From a companion of the Apostle Paul, we should expect generally a different treatment and description of the earliest period of Christian history from that which we find in the Gospel and in the first part of the Acts; and, in particular, we can hardly ascribe to such a person the account of the miracle of the Pentecost. (4) The circumstance would not admit of being explained how, instead of the better-known Timothy, Luke should have been accepted as the

<sup>1</sup> In the second edition (I. 16) Baur expresses himself more definitely. See below, p. 48 (Overbeck).

author (Bleek). But if now we assume that the author of the Acts, from the passage xvi. 10 onwards, made use of Timothy's diary of his travels, then again we are met by the difficulty of explaining how, under the assumption, which we must also make, of the free use of the document as materials,—the style and entire literary peculiarity of the Acts, be it observed, remaining in this division the same as in the other portions of the book,—the term *ημεῖς* could have been left standing; a difficulty, however, with which that arising under the other assumption, viz. how the author can have left in such obscurity the commencement of his companionship with Paul, upon his travels (Bleek), is about equally balanced.

The preceding observations of De Wette, in the attempt to solve the problem before us, no doubt start from a correct fundamental conception. But, in the end, they themselves give the problem up without a definite answer, and do not even make an attempt to determine more exactly the manner in which the author of the Acts has availed himself of the source which, it is assumed, he found open to him. In both these respects, it is attempted in the following remarks, in which the entire question is discussed from the outset, to offer the student some additional assistance.

1. The sections of the Acts which surprise us by appearing in the communicative form of narrative (xvi. 10—17; xx. 4—15; xxi. 1—18; xxvii. 1—xxviii. 16), are likewise distinguished from the rest of the book by other *peculiarities* of form and contents.

(a) *Peculiarities of Form*.—Along with a relationship which on the whole undeniably exists between the style of expression in the *ημεῖς* sections and the general style of the Acts (vide Zeller, pp. 514 sqq.; Klostermann, pp. 46 sqq.; Oertel, pp. 28 sqq.), the language of those sections nevertheless shows some special idiosyncrasies (vide the references in Zeller, p. 574). But these sections likewise possess another peculiarity, in which they present a great contrast to the rest of the narrative; we mean their

circumstantiality or fullness of detail. Other points foreign to the general style of the Acts are :

(α) The way in which the route of Paul's journeys is pursued, even to accidental places that are matters of perfect indifference to the subject (xvi. 11; xx. 13 sqq.; xxi. 1 sqq.; xxviii. 12 sqq.).

(β) The cumulation and regularity of the daily chronological data (xvi. 11; xx. 6, 13, 15; xxi. 1, 4, 7, 18; xxviii. 7 sqq., 12), which appear to be given only for their own sake. It is of course surprising that in the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  sections, as soon as they cease to be a mere itinerary, the chronology either becomes completely confused (cf. xvi. 12; xx. 16 sqq.; xxi. 10, 15), or at least ceases to proceed from day to day (xx. 6—12; xxi. 4—6; xxviii. 14), nay, even embraces periods of several months (xxviii. 1—11). On the opposite score we find, as the only surprising omission of the itinerary, the lack of a statement of the duration of the march from Puteoli to Rome (xxviii. 4). Other additional peculiarities foreign to the Acts are :

(γ) Statements of details as in xvi. 12; xx. 13; xxi. 2, 3; xxviii. 2, 11. Especially in ch. xxvii. the narrative devotes, not only to the persons actively concerned, but also to the external and accidental scenery connected with the events, an attention which is otherwise without example in the Acts.<sup>1</sup>

(b) *Peculiarities in the Contents.*—The  $\eta\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  sections belong almost exclusively to the itinerary of the Pauline journeys,—the only exceptions being the passages, xvi. 12—17; xx. 7—12; xxi. 4—6, 8—14; and xxviii. 1—10. It is connected with this fact that for the most part they coincide with voyages made by Paul (xvi. 11; xx. 6, 13—15; xxi. 1—3, 7; xxvii. 1—44; xxviii. 11—13). Conversely also the voyages of Paul, from

<sup>1</sup> Against the character here given to the form of the narrative in the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  sections, especially against points β and γ, the narrative of the trial of Paul appears capable of being urged as an objection. But as regards local details, in this very portion of the work, where the greatest external relationship is exhibited with the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  sections, they have reference to particular objects of the narrative ; and the same is the case with the chronology of sections xxi. 17—24, xxv. 1—12, and with the chronology of xxviii. 17. How summary, on the other hand, the chronology of this narrative really is, is shown particularly by xxiv. 27.

ch. xvi. onwards, are mostly told by ήμεῖς sections, the only exceptions being xvii. 14; xviii. 18, 23 [?]; and xx. 1. Add to this that in the ήμεῖς sections the characteristic tendencies of the Acts retreat in a marked manner into the background; that in consequence of their details they for the most part disconnect themselves with the narrative of the Acts (especially ch. xxvii.); that their accounts of miracles (xvi. 16 sqq.; xx. 7 sqq.; xxvii. 10, 22 sqq.; xxviii. 3 sqq.) in particular are characteristically distinguished from the others related in the Acts by their appearance of naturalness (*Lekebusch*, pp. 382 sqq.; *Köstlin*, Urspr. u. Compos. der Synopt. Evv. pp. 291 sqq.; cf. also *Ewald*, p. 39, Anm.), and in general, like scarcely any other narratives of the New Testament, challenge an explanation based on natural causes. Only in two cases (xvi. 40 [cf. vers. 14 sqq.] and xxi. 8 [cf. vi. 5; viii. 40]) have ήμεῖς passages been brought indubitably and expressly into the connection of the narrative of the Acts. On two occasions in these sections (xx. 6 and xxvii. 9) the Jewish Calendar has been employed.

2. Such being the facts of the case, the question now is, whether the ήμεῖς sections are by the author of the Acts, or whether they betray the existence of a written source from which he drew materials. On the assumption of the first alternative, Irenæus already (Adv. Hær. iii. 14, 1) bases the traditional opinion that the Acts is the work of a travelling companion of Paul. Up to the time of Konigsmann (1798), this assumption was, generally speaking, not doubted, and in conjunction with the opinion in question it still remains the prevailing one.<sup>1</sup> At present, indeed, this view is for the most part held in its strictest form, in which its most thorough champion is Klostermann, and it is in this form alone that we shall for the

<sup>1</sup> Olshausen; Meyer; Bisping; Hackett, pp. 15 sqq.; Schneckenburger, pp. 17 sqq.; Thiersch, Versuch zur Herstell. &c. pp. 209 sqq.; Lekebusch, pp. 181 sqq.; Baumgarten, I. 495 sqq. et passim; Ewald, pp. 34 sqq.; Klostermann; Trip, Paul nach d. AG. pp. 30 sqq.; Oertel, Paul in der AG. pp. 7 sqq.; Renan, *Les Apôtres*, pp. 10 sqq., St. Paul, pp. 130 sqq.; Holtzm. in Bunsen's Bibelw. VIII. 347 sqq.; Riggengb die AG. p. 10, &c. &c.

present endeavour to arrive at an estimate of it, the connection of the *ημεῖς* sections with the Acts being, according to this view, thoroughly original.<sup>1</sup> But if under this supposition, as is assumed, the author of the Acts (Luke) is to represent himself in the *ημεῖς* sections as an eye-witness of what is therein related, and to intimate this personal share of his in the events precisely by the use of *ημεῖς* on each occasion, then the peculiarities of the *ημεῖς* sections, their intermittent character, and the conduct pursued by the writer in regard to them, become inexplicable. As regards the peculiarities of language in these sections, we may no doubt concede to the champions of this hypothesis that they are inadequate to prove the case against them (Klostermann, p. 62; Oertel, pp. 33 sqq.); but, argued upon this ground, their special circumstantiality of detail cannot be accounted for, and that which is characteristic in their contents must be flatly ignored. It is intimately connected herewith that the fact of the *ημεῖς* sections being intermittent is also made here to disappear. It is at any rate false, if the occurrence and non-occurrence of the term *ημεῖς* are intended to correspond to the presence and absence of the narrator (vide Oertel, p. 38). This cannot be applied to the narrative, xx. 4—xxviii. 32; and it is applicable to xvi. 18—xx. 4, only if we accept the usual conclusion from the re-appearance of *ημεῖς* at Macedonia, namely, that the author of the *ημεῖς* sections remained behind in Philippi during the time covered by the narrative, xvii. 1—xx. 3 (vide infra against this). However, even for this passage the expedient just mentioned cannot, on the supposition of the identity of the author of the *ημεῖς* sections and of the Acts, be made to fit in with the facts. Even supposing we entirely disregard the arguments which may be borrowed in its favour from the incredibility of the narrative, xvi. 18—40 (insufficiently shown in Renan, St. Paul, p. 152), and from the comparative circumstantiality of the narrative, xix. 23—41, yet

<sup>1</sup> Respecting the view which attempts to reconcile the difficulty by making a diary written by the author of the Acts at an earlier period the foundation of the *ημεῖς* sections, see further remarks infra.

even then the proportion borne by the detailed narrative of the *ημεῖς* sections to the scantiness of the intervening portions remains incomprehensible. For even if Paul's travelling companion, who begins to speak in xvi. 10, was not an immediate eye-witness of the facts told in xvii. 1—xx. 3, yet it is obvious that a person so placed could not have possessed, in regard to the section of Paul's life referred to in xvii. 1—xx. 3, merely the scanty knowledge displayed in this passage (in contradiction to Holtzmann). Nor can we say that the author was not willing to make use here of his richer knowledge, for this would be directly refuted by the *ημεῖς* passages, in so far as it results from them that the author was not inclined to leave out of consideration his personal position with regard to the events, and that he not simply intimates on each occasion that he was an eye-witness, but always in such cases begins to tell the story in greater detail. But it is equally incapable of being maintained that the term *ημεῖς* ceases to appear where the events only concerned the Apostle alone or other companions of his (Oertel, loc. cit.). This assumption at least shuts its eyes to the surprising fact of the coincidence of the Pauline itinerary with the *ημεῖς* sections, and is obliged to regard it as accidental that the terms of familiarity on which the author of the *ημεῖς* sections represents himself as living with Paul, are found scarcely anywhere except where Paul is upon a rapid journey, and cease soon or immediately when he stays in any locality.<sup>1</sup> If, therefore, we cannot in any case explain the intermittent character of the *ημεῖς* sections and their peculiarity from the personal position of the author of the Acts in relation to the events, then the only course remaining is to do so by help of the plan and connection of the book. But with these the *ημεῖς* sections are rather, on the contrary, disconnected. The original connection stated to exist between the *ημεῖς* sections and the Acts is supported, in the first place, on the direct refer-

<sup>1</sup> Even the expedient of assuming that the author wrote from the point of view of his sojourn in Macedonia cannot be of any use here as regards the passage, xvi. 18—xx. 3; at any rate in so far that it is inapplicable to xvi. 18—40.

ences, retrospective and prospective, which, it is asserted, are to be found in them to the rest of the book. Everything, however, which in this respect has been collected together by Schneckenburger, pp. 22 sqq.; Klostermann, *passim*; Oertel, pp. 25 sqq., and others, reduces itself to the few cases already acknowledged above (xvi. 14; xxi. 8); and even were they more numerous, they would nevertheless lack (as Schneckenburger, p. 22, himself acknowledges) the power to prove the identity of the author of the Acts with the author of the *ημεῖς* sections. This force is wanting in most of the examples collected by Oertel, because, without seeking any other reason, they do not belong to the *ημεῖς* sections at all<sup>1</sup>.

Such other arguments as are adduced in favour of the connection of the *ημεῖς* sections with the general plan of the Acts, where they do not exaggerate this plan, fail to exclude the assumption that the author of the book worked up materials derived from a more ancient source. Of late Klostermann has most exerted himself to prove the inseparability of the *ημεῖς* sections from the Acts. His proof, however, fails even for ch. xxvii. and xxviii. (pp. 12 sqq.). If we here grant it as a matter of little importance that Klostermann is neither able to explain the character of the narrative, xxviii. 1—10, as compared with the circumstantiality of xxvii. 1—44 and xxviii. 11—16, nor has refuted Zeller's assumption of an interpolation of the original source in the case of the passage, xxvii. 21—26, yet it is correct to say that on the whole the connection in the section, xxvii. 1—xxviii. 16, is restricted to itself. So much the more surprising does the disconnection of the passage, xxviii. 17—32, with that in question appear, and the cursory remark on this section in Klostermann, pp. 18 sqq., is far from sufficient to do away with the fact that the narrative, xxviii. 17—32, is as directly and completely explained by considerations derived from the Acts, as the passage,

<sup>1</sup> But in the case of Oertel, the problem of the *ημεῖς* sections generally is not by any means taken up with rigour or precision, being considered exclusively in connection with the refutation of Schleiermacher and Schwanbeck's views of the composition of the Acts.

xxvii. 1—xxviii. 16, on the whole appears there at first enigmatical, having in the Acts absolutely nothing analogous except the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\bar{\iota}\bar{\iota}$  sections, here in general under discussion.<sup>1</sup> But when Klostermann derives the circumstantiality of this narrative from the importance which Luke attributed to Paul's journey to Rome (p. 38), he, in doing so, imputes to the author of the Acts an allegorical style in which nobody writes history. For in a historical style it would be the most unnatural trifling to express the importance of that journey by going to the length of particularizing halting-places that were matters of perfect indifference, and even describing the nautical details of the voyage. On similar grounds it is impossible to deduce the details of xx. 6 sqq., and especially the catalogue of halting-places in xx. 6, 13 sqq. and xxi. 1 sqq., *directly* from the interest of the writer in the last return journey of Paul to Jerusalem (in opposition to the opinion of Klostermann, p. 38); or to derive the description in xvi. 11—15 *immediately* from an intention to express the importance of the event of Paul's crossing over to Europe (Klostermann, p. 39).<sup>2</sup> But besides failing before the contrast of the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\bar{\iota}\bar{\iota}$  sections with the rest of the Acts, the foregoing hypothesis also collapses by reason of the utterly unparalleled procedure which it is compelled to impute to the author of the Acts by the appearance and disappearance of the communicative form of narration, without the way being prepared for it. The explanation given by the older exegetical writers, that it was out of modesty that the author did not express himself more clearly (vide Irenæus, loc. cit.), does no doubt still continue to find acceptance (Olshausen;

<sup>1</sup> This fact itself involuntarily comes out in Klostermann in the coincidence that the traces of an eye-witness in the narrative, ch. xxvii. and xxviii.—traces which are in part no doubt worthy of attention, and which he has collected in pp. 12 sqq.—are all of them taken from the section xxvii. 1—xxviii. 16 alone.

<sup>2</sup> To what absurdities writers can be tempted to go in the effort to derive the details of the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\bar{\iota}\bar{\iota}$  sections from the proper connection of the Acts, is first thoroughly shown by observations such as those of Baumgarten respecting the sign of the ship, xxviii. 11 (ii. 483); or respecting the journey on foot, xx. 18, and the catalogue of halting-places commencing in verse 14 (ii. 56). His observations in ii. 47 sqq. also, respecting the daily chronology beginning in xx. 6, answer themselves by their omissions alone, xx. 17—38; xxi. 10.

Lekebusch, p. 188; Baumgarten, I. 27, 496 sqq.; and Ewald, pp. 33 sqq. [who speaks of an “irrepressible feeling”]); but, apart from the fact that the modesty of the author of the Acts is historically an unknown quantity, this explanation, were it only on account of the morbid and doubtful notion which it presupposes the author of the Acts to have had of modesty, while at the same time it was quite open to him to observe silence respecting himself, can be accepted as nothing more than an exceedingly lame invention to which theological expositors have found themselves driven by necessity. Nor does the acquaintance of Theophilus, or of the first readers of the Acts, with the affairs of the author advance the explanation of this problem (Meyer, on xvi. 10; Schneckenburger, p. 40; Ewald, pp. 34 sqq.; Holtzm. p. 348; Laurent, Neutestamentl. Studien; Gotha, 1868, pp. 85, 182 sqq.), even granting, so far as concerns Theophilus, that the acceptance of the Acts as a private document, intended only for the requirements of a single individual, were justified.<sup>1</sup> For since the appearance and disappearance of *ἡμεῖς*, without a word paving the way for the transition, are repeated four times in the Acts, this assumption would presuppose on the part of the first readers of the book, so exact a knowledge of Luke’s travelling diary, that the communication of the fragments we find given would also appear superfluous, and thus also the violation of otherwise customary literary forms is in no way explained. Recently in the *ἐγώ*, occurring in the exordium as well of the Acts (i. 1) as of Luke’s Gospel (i. 1—4), some writers, like Ewald, have been disposed to find the preparation for the term *ἡμεῖς*,—a discovery which, however, will not stand its ground for the simple reason that the *ἐγώ* in these passages is not by a single word brought into connection with the *ἡμεῖς* which makes its appearance in Acts xvi. 10. But when, in the words, *οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου*, Luke i. 2, Klostermann finds it intimated, at least for the initiated Theophilus, that at a

<sup>1</sup> Even for the plan and connection of the Acts, Klostermann, pp. 68 sqq., assumes that there existed an understanding with Theophilus from the outset.

later period of his story Luke himself will appear as an eye-witness in this case,—even apart from the unwarranted use here made of Theophilus, and the false assumption of a reference in Luke i. 1—4 to the Acts (see the arguments against this above, p. 6),—the antithesis in which the author of Luke's Gospel, i. 1—4, places himself, is disturbed, since, by the words ἔδοξε κάμοι, verse 3, he puts himself in one rank with the πολλοί, and also in opposition to them, while on the other hand he plainly distinguishes the latter and himself from those who are described as *οἱ ἀπόχῆς αὐτόπται*.<sup>1</sup> To appeal, however, in favour of the singularity of the author's procedure in the case of the term *ημεῖς*, to the incompleteness of the Acts (Ewald, p. 34), would be to assume an improbability, even if the incompleteness in question had otherwise been proved, inasmuch as what we have here to explain would, as will be admitted, be something of a different character from the half-verses of Virgil.<sup>2</sup>

3. Accordingly, at all events, the assumption that the author of the Acts is different from the author of the *ημεῖς* sections is so far correct; but it is untenable in its original form, which it first received from Konigsmann (in Pott's Sylloge, iii. 231), and from Schleiermacher especially (Einl. pp. 346 sqq.), and later from the rest of the champions of the Timothy hypothesis (with the exception of Mayerhoff, vide supra, p. 32) and Schwanbeck (cf. also Reuss, § 211). According to this view, the *ημεῖς* sections would be fragments of a diary kept by one of Paul's companions and lying before the author of the Acts, which fragments he incorporated in his work with so little change, that in the term *ημεῖς* he left them their subjective form. The assumption of so undigested an intercalation of the *ημεῖς* sections in the Acts is, however, open to the following objections :

<sup>1</sup> Accordingly from the prologue of the third Gospel, if it referred, among other things, to the Acts, we might rather draw the most telling argument against the identity of the author of the Acts and of the *ημεῖς* sections.

<sup>2</sup> Respecting the arguments which may be drawn from xx. 4 and xxvii. 2 against the original unity of the *ημεῖς* sections and the text of the Acts, cf. the commentary upon the passages in question.

(a) The affinity which exists between the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  sections, notwithstanding all their dissimilarities, and the rest of the Acts. On this point, the remarks made above, on page 33, respecting the language of the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  sections have great weight. But still more decisive is the fact that this hypothesis is compelled to pass by the method with which the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  sections have been interwoven into the body of the Acts (vide infra), and to consider as quite accidental the peculiarities pointed out above, pp. 34 sq., respecting the relation of the contents of the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  sections to the intervening portions of the Acts.

(b) Here, too, the way in which the author of the Acts has dealt with the form of his source is not to be explained. His conduct in this respect is at most only intelligible on the standpoint of Schleiermacher and Schwanbeck, to whom the Acts appears as a thoroughly spiritless compilation from older written sources; and it cannot fail to become more and more inconceivable the more closely we attempt to realize it, even from the standpoint of these commentators.<sup>1</sup> At all events, there exists no trustworthy analogy for the Acts. For as such we cannot regard those cases in the historical books of the Old Testament in which the sporadic and unprepared-for appearance of the First Person is looked upon as a trace of older written sources,<sup>2</sup> because the author of the Acts, apart from the art which he otherwise displays, betrays already in his prologues (i. 1 sq.; Luke i. 1—4) a much more developed literary consciousness. The analogies also which have been produced<sup>3</sup> out of Apocryphal Gospels and mediæval chroniclers, belong to much less culti-

<sup>1</sup> Cf., for example, what Ulrich (St. u. Kr. 1837, pp. 371 sq.) adduces as Schleiermacher's view, and what he himself (p. 372) proposes in its place.

<sup>2</sup> In the books of Ezra and Nehemiah (vidē Ewald, Gesch. d. Volk. Isr. I. 258 sqq., 2nd ed.). Cf. also Tobit, ch. i.—iii.

<sup>3</sup> Analogies from chroniclers have been produced by Schwanbeck, pp. 188 sqq. (which have been appealed to by De Wette, Einl. in d. N. T., § 115 a, Anm. e,—in spite of his better knowledge of the way the sources of the Acts have been employed,—and by Bleek, Einl. p. 329); and from Protev. Jac. C. 18, p. 240 Thilo. by Hilgenfeld, Krit. Unters. über die Kvv. Justius, &c. p. 154.

vated stages of literature than the Acts of the Apostles (cf. Zeller, p. 357; Lekebusch, pp. 137 sqq.).

4. At all events, the memoir written by Paul's companion, which is betrayed by the *ημεῖς* sections, must have been subjected by the author of the Acts to a free re-employment, assimilating its materials to the rest of his work, and subordinating them to his aims,—a process in which the retention of the *ημεῖς* only admits of being explained by some special design. As this design, however, nothing more probable has been assigned than the purpose of the author to pass for one of Paul's companions (Zeller, pp. 456 sq.; Baur, Paul, i. 16 sq.; Hilgenfeld, Evv. p. 225; Stap, *Origines du Christianisme*, pp. 205 sq., 2nd ed.).<sup>1</sup> In order, however, to arrive at a clearer picture of the way in which the author has dealt with his source, we must first make out at least a general representation of its original contents. From what has been hitherto said, it follows as a matter of course that the source appears only in fragments in the *ημεῖς* sections (cf. also Zeller, pp. 515 sq.), or that it cannot be reconstructed out of the *ημεῖς* sections alone. The commencement of it is lost. For the assumption that this commencement coincides with what first appears of the original source in xvi. 10 of the Acts, is excluded by the way in which the source makes its entrance—cf. further also De Wette's acute observation respecting the term *συμβιβάζοντες*, xvi. 10, infra, against which Lekebusch, pp. 143 sq., only urges objections of no weight—although the source probably did

<sup>1</sup> It is also possible that the author, in taking up the position of an eye-witness with regard to Paul, only intended to strengthen the credibility of his apologetic exposition and the impression intended to be produced by it. Such is the theory of Köstlin, Syn. Evv. p. 293, whose arguments against Zeller's view do not, however, stand their ground. Very plausible is, moreover, the objection that, if the author of the Acts had intended to identify himself with Paul's companion who speaks in the *ημεῖς* sections, he would not have suppressed the important event when the latter became acquainted with Paul (p. 291). However, considering that we are entirely in ignorance of this event, such a conclusion is very uncertain, because it is very readily conceivable that the event in the original source was connected with circumstances completely disqualifying it from appearing in the Acts. It is only an analogous reflection that protects Köstlin's own view against the objection derived from the very limited use made of the character of eye-witness in the Acts.

not extend back to a time much earlier than that in question [xvi. 10].<sup>1</sup> At all events, the source extended over a period of Paul's life embracing several years, and limited at least by xvi. 10 and xxviii. 16; and in all probability it contained a very thorough description of Paul's apostolic journeys by the hand of an associate. As regards the assumption in particular that it had been a mere itinerary, the more general grounds in its favour disappear as soon as the *ημεῖς* sections are acknowledged as mere fragments taken out of their original connection. But there are general grounds telling against this assumption, in so far as probably no record can be constructed which would give so exact an account respecting the route of Paul's travels registered in *ημεῖς* sections, ch. xvi.—xxviii., and yet contain nothing in reference to the interruptions, some of them of several years' duration, which occur in the journeys in question; and especially is it difficult to realize the object of such a record. But that the source cannot originally have been a mere itinerary, may also be directly demonstrated from the existing fragments, that is, from all the passages they contain which are more than this (xvi. 12; xx. 6—12; xxi. 4—6, 8—14; xxviii. 1—11, 14). In regard to these passages, it was no doubt above (p 34) asserted, that they exhibit a surprising contrast to the usual style of the *ημεῖς* sections, which elsewhere is full of details; or that, as in xxi. 8, they betray a more direct connection with the narrative of the Acts than these sections themselves. The only question is, whether everything here, that is, the preponderatingly itinerary character of the *ημεῖς* sections, and the peculiarities of the passages they contain that are not mere itinerary, is not to be ex-

<sup>1</sup> On this point, the considerations adduced below respecting the author's employment of the *ημεῖς* source in the narrative of the second and third missionary journeys of Paul, at least permit the conjecture that he did not find the source as yet available for the first journey. This already conflicts with the Lectio Apocrypha xi. 28 : *ἡν δὲ πολλὴ ἀγαλλίασις. Συνεστραμμένων δὲ ημῶν ἀναστὰς εἰς, κ. τ. λ.,* a reading which is at all events too insufficiently attested by Cod. D and August. De Serm. Dom. ii. 57 (though defended by Ewald, Gesch. d. V. Isr. vi. 39, 3rd ed.), but which of course would, if true, establish an entirely different representation of the extent of the *ημεῖς* source. See further, § 2 b.

plained very simply, as springing from one root,—the uniformity of plan with which the author of the Acts has made excerpts from his source and worked up his materials. This now is entirely the case in the following exposition of the method pursued by the author in dealing with his source. What strikes us as most surprising, on noticing more closely the distribution of the *ημεῖς* sections over the Acts, is the relationship or similarity of the situations in which the *ημεῖς* source on each occasion makes its appearance. It is clear, in the next place, that the author three times makes a characteristic use of this source, by re-producing in its language the three important events of (1) Paul's first crossing over to Europe (xvi. 10—17); (2) the close of his third missionary journey, or his last return to Jerusalem (xx. 5—xxi. 18); and (3) his journey to Rome (xxvii. 1—xxviii. 16), whereby the appearance of the itinerary portion of the source is already explained. But this application itself of the source stands in a very intimate relation to the composition of the Acts, especially to the plan of the narrative. These relations, however, can be pursued much more deeply, and they will explain not simply the adoption of the source, but also the excisions from it, and the modifications which the part adopted has undergone, as arising from the same aims on the part of the narrator. The first occasion on which the author employs the source is the pregnant moment when the Apostle crosses over to Europe, xvi. 10 sqq., that is, precisely at the commencement of that part of Paul's journey to which on this occasion the interest of the narrative is especially addressed.<sup>1</sup> However, he very soon breaks off, since for the theme of his narrative of Paul's second missionary journey (his activity as independent Apostle to the Gen-

<sup>1</sup> It is therefore quite correct that the expounders, combatted above, pp. 35 sqq., attribute to the *ημεῖς* sections the design to characterize the importance of the circumstances to which they belong. The great difference between the opinion here represented and theirs only lies in the fact that the author of the Acts makes use for his object of another's words, borrowed from a sketch lying before him, and that consequently an explanation is here first given of the fact, which must remain inexplicable for the commentators in question, that his thoughts are clothed in a form so far from being directly congruous with them.

tiles), in the way in which the theme has been dealt with in the Acts, the memoir of the associate of the Apostle was, we should say, eminently unsuited. The source is not employed again before the close of the third missionary journey, xx. 4, that is, upon the introduction of the principal circumstance on which the interest of the narrative now hinges.<sup>1</sup> But on this occasion it lies in the very nature of the event itself, that the author can abide much longer by the source (viz. till xxi. 18), and hence also he now offers us far more abundant opportunity of observing his peculiar method of procedure. In general it is here the author's purpose to characterize this last journey of Paul, xx. 5—xxi. 18, as a farewell journey, and the two principal means he employs to this end are the adoption of the detailed description from the source, and the insertion of a speech (xx. 16—38). This interpolation is accordingly the principal modification which the author here introduces into the original text of the source, but it is far from being the only one. It is clear in the next place that the entire section, xx. 5—xxi. 18, is held together by the uniformity of its composition. Everything here is subservient to the purpose of telling the story of a farewell journey—to wit, the itinerary (xx. 5, 6, 13—15; xxi. 1—3, 7, 15, 16)—and likewise everything he has inserted, so far as, with the exception of xxi. 8, it entirely concerns farewell scenes, including the passage xx. 7—12,—scenes which bring out the particular importance of the journey of the Apostle as his last journey to Jerusalem (xx. 16—38; xxi. 4, 10 sqq.). If, however, we attend

<sup>1</sup> Nothing is more doubtful than the so-called Macedonian standpoint of the Pauline memoir as regards the narratives in xvi. 18—xx. 3 (vide supra, p. 37), which, since Schneckenburger's remarks, p. 43, has been almost universally accepted (and that even by Zeller too, p. 513). It is of course, at all events, no mere matter of accident that the second *μετά* section recommences at the same place where the first breaks off. The only question is, whether this is to be explained as arising immediately out of the memoir, or as resulting from the way in which the memoir has been employed in the Acts. But, in the latter, in accordance with the composition of Paul's journeys, his entry into Macedonia, xvi. 10, has a significance analogous to his departure from that country, xx. 8. It is on this ground principally that the explanation, above preferred, of the intermission of the memoir between xvi. 18 and xx. 8 is based. The correct view is also intimated by Weizsäcker.

more closely to the peculiarities of the narrative, and exclude the passage xx. 16—38, which in substance is already known—then if, supposing the portions xx. 5—15; xxi. 1—14, which are mutually allied in form and referable to the written source, are taken out of the text of the Acts, we cannot with these materials construct any source in which we could explain the poverty of the narrative, xx. 7—12; xxi. 4—6, 8—14 (where a sojourn of Paul for several days in a place is in every case passed over in the briefest manner), occurring, as this scantiness would do, in immediate contact with the circumstantiality of the itinerary proper. But the general coherency of the narrative suggests the conjecture that the modifying hand of the author of the Acts has been exercised precisely upon these passages. According to the aim of the section, xx. 5—xxi. 18, which has been already stated, the interest of the author of the Acts and that of his source only coincided so far as the latter concerned Paul's journey to Jerusalem as such, but that their interest was not identical, so far as the source in connection with this journey reported also about other matters, and in particular about the lengthened stay of Paul in this or the other locality. However, this consideration would only explain the excisions which the author of the Acts had probably made in dealing with this portion of his source. But the passages quoted betray so close a connection with the special aims of the narrative of the Acts, that they have either been adopted simply on account of this connection (xx. 7—12), or have been interpolated straightway into the source (xxi. 4, 8, 10—14). After having employed an extract from the source to announce the arrival of Paul in Jerusalem (xxi. 15, 16), he puts it aside, and then having, as seems probable in the transitional passage, verses 17, 18, arbitrarily given his own words the form of the *ημεῖς* source, he proceeds to the narrative, xxi. 17—xxvi. 32, which entirely identifies itself with the peculiar tendencies of his work. In the passage xxvii. 1, he again reaches a culminating point of his story, the journey of Paul to Rome, for the description of which the memoir of

Paul's companion, after the use the author of the Acts had already made of it, naturally offered itself to him. This section, xxvii. 1—xxviii. 16, is regarded as the longest of those produced in the form of the source; and here again the author adopts the portions of his source belonging strictly to the account of the journey in the most complete and intact form (xxvii. 1—44; xxviii. 11—16). Yet even in the sketch of the sea voyage, xxvii. 1—44, he makes some small interpolations belonging to the peculiar connection of his own narrative; but he modifies the account given in the source most materially in the passages where a break is described in the journey, and the lengthy sojourn of Paul in Malta (xxviii. 1—10) and in Puteoli (xxviii. 14) he in part strongly modifies, in part adapts in other ways to his special purposes; while in xxviii. 15 he has probably again imparted to his own words the form of the source. At the passage xxviii. 16, the author again entirely abandons the source, and thus, with the narrative xxviii. 17 sqq., which once more entirely belongs to the general connection of the book, he brings his work to a conclusion.

This exposition of the author's procedure, ascribing to him no doubt a somewhat biassed method of employing the original sources, may be further supported by observations of a different nature. It is in the first place a surprising fact that precisely those narratives which immediately follow the text of the *ημεῖς* sections, and in a measure interrupt it, also for internal reasons belong to the least trustworthy in the Pauline part of the Acts, and most pointedly betray their particular bias, or else are interwoven with particular intricacy into the literary plan of the book. These are the narratives of the arrest and release of Paul and Silas in Philippi, xvi. 18—40; the notice in xx. 16, and the Milesian address, xx. 17 sqq.; the narratives of Paul's vow of purification, xxi. 18 sqq., and of his meeting with the Roman Jews, xxviii. 17 sqq. These narratives appear likewise to contain the motive which determined the author in each instance to drop the text of the memoir he had before him. At least the

fact here pointed out will hardly admit of a simpler explanation than the need which the author—after allowing the source, where it less directly subserved his aims, to speak to a certain length—felt of coming forward the more conspicuously in his own person, and perhaps also the need he felt of putting in the place of a narrative contained in the source, one of a directly opposite tendency (a conjecture which suggests itself very readily in the case of the passage xxi. 18—26). A far more important support is afforded to the view established above respecting the author's method of dealing with his source, by the striking analogy which it presents to the author's attitude with regard to tradition respecting Paul in general. Even if we take the *ημεῖς* sections exactly as they present themselves to us in the Acts, their contents are nevertheless limited almost exclusively to the itinerary of some of Paul's journeys (vide supra, p. 33 sq.), and the additional matter they present, if we except xvi. 14 sq., xxi. 8 sq., and the prophetic admonitions, xxi. 4, 10 sqq., consist simply of miracles worked by Paul, xvi. 16 sq.; xx. 7—12; xxviii. 1—10. This limited interest on the part of the author of the Acts in the circumstantial memoir he had before him by one of Paul's companions, is precisely a thing which explains itself. Considering the attitude of the Acts with regard to Paul and Paulinism, such a memoir could not of course fail to contain a number of things which were absolutely incapable of being utilized for this book, and it lies in the nature of the matter that of the contents of the memoir the itinerary was least likely to be subjected to critical excisions and modifications at the hands of the author of the Acts, and that it was best adapted for adoption, and, on the other hand, that those parts of the memoir are reproduced least completely and directly which dwelt on Paul's apostolic work as such. But if the author of the Acts has addressed himself to that portion of the contents of his source which from his point of view was least compromising—we mean the itinerary (as indeed, likewise characteristically for him, he has done prevailingly so far as concerns the

.sea voyages of Paul, vide supra, pp. 34, 35) and the chronological framework—or if he has chosen what was most interesting, that is, the stories of marvels, it is at once self-evident how close a relation such a mode of using the source bears to the narrative in the Acts with regard to Paul generally, in which indeed the itinerary of Paul's journeys, at least so far as concerns the portion of the book from xiii. 1—xxi. 16, likewise forms the solid skeleton of the narrative (cf. supra, p. 26); and as to the other points, that which alone interests the author in the true Paul is his miracles, while whatever else is told of the Apostle is at any rate without any analogy in the fragments of the Pauline memoir communicated by the author, and, indeed, according to the entire representation here presupposed of the relation of the memoir and of the Acts to Paul, cannot have any such analogy at all in the fragments in question. With this view of the contents of the memoir and their employment in the Acts, all the facts collected above under § 1, pp. 33 sq., will probably be most simply explained,<sup>1</sup> and the only further question that can arise is whether the independent parallel portions of the Acts, xvi. 18—xx. 4; xx. 16—38; xxi. 17—xxvi. 32; xxviii. 17—31, have anything at all to do with the memoir. As regards the far greater part of these sections, we have at any rate no cause for tracing it back to the employment of the memoir, since this portion is far too closely and characteristically bound up with

<sup>1</sup> The facts noted on the same page in regard to the style of the *ημεῖς* sections do not impede this view, because on those facts in general nothing decisive can in any case be here established. It still no doubt remains worthy of attention, that within the *ημεῖς* sections it is the passages which by their contents are open to the suspicion of having been added by the author to the Acts, that also show the greatest relationship with the style of the entire book (*Zeller*, p. 515). The style, however, would not in any case suffice to justify the separation of the *ημεῖς* sections from the Acts. On the other hand, the fact of the affinity between the *ημεῖς* sections and the Acts in point of language is not decisive of their original connection, since the degree to which the author assimilated the source to his own style is incapable of being determined, and there is nothing to forbid our supposing that he carried this process of assimilation to any extent we please, short of the term *ημεῖς*, which he intentionally retained (in opposition to the references quoted by *Klostermann*). It is on altogether unsafe ground that the argument is based which *Schneckenburger* (p. 20) derives from the character of the *ημεῖς* sections, as being written in a good Greek style.

the proper narrative of the author of the Acts, while, on the other hand, it has no points of connection with the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  sections. (Most evident is this precisely in the case of the most circumstantial of these sections, xxi. 17—xxvi. 32.) It is only in the case of touches of detail, such as the notice, xix. 22; the names, xvii. 5; xx. 4; the assignments of dates, xviii. 11; xix. 8, 10; *the transitional passage*, xxi. 17 sqq.; and the precise details, xxiii. 16 sq.; xxiv. 27; xxviii. 30, that we may at any rate conjecture the author to have borrowed them from the memoir. Cf. also Zeller, p. 523. Perhaps also the memoir has at least suggested the narrative xxi. 17—26.<sup>1</sup>

5. Of subordinate interest, yet for the most part placed falsely in the foreground (vide particularly *Schneckenburger*, p. 151), is the question, which can only be answered conjecturally, as to the name and person of the author of the source from which the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  sections were derived. The view that it was a work of Luke's, possesses over all other hypotheses proposed on the subject the decisive advantage of enjoying a support in tradition, in so far as it affords a very probable explanation of the way in which the third Gospel and the Acts were put down to Luke's account, whether the author of the Gospel and the Acts was inferred from the author of the memoir (*Gfrör. h. Sage*, ii. 245 sq.; *Köstl.* p. 291), or, what appears the more correct (vide supra,

<sup>1</sup> In these considerations we have already virtually rebutted the assumption, mentioned above on p. 36, of the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  sections being derived from a diary written by the author of the Acts. This assumption cannot succeed in giving any explanation of the circumstance that the excerpts from a diary by that writer, which must be taken to have extended over a number of years, refer almost exclusively to the routes of journeys; and the assumption likewise fails by reason of the difference observable within the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  sections themselves, in the character of the narrative (as manifested, for example, especially in xxviii. 1—10 as compared with xxvii. 1—44; xxviii. 11—15). We have likewise in the text passed over the hypothesis which in itself is still possible, and which assumes the identity of the origin of the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  sections and of the rest of the text of the Acts, but regards the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  sections as a falsification by the author of the Acts, because in *Schrader*, Paul, v. 549, 556, 570, and *Bruno Bauer*, die Apostelgesch. pp. 181 sq., this hypothesis only appears in the form of a fancy left without demonstration, and because it could not be made to harmonize with the facts of the problem, collected above on pp. 33, 34, at any rate except in the most artificial manner.

p. 43), that the author of the Gospel and the Acts wanted to pass for Luke (*Zeller*, pp. 459 sq. 516). Against this view there is an argument, worthy indeed of notice but very unsafe, that nowhere, not even in the four principal Pauline Epistles in particular, is Luke mentioned<sup>1</sup> as a companion of Paul in the time preceding his imprisonment. In this point alone is the *Luke* hypothesis at a disadvantage as compared with the conjecture that the author of the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  source was *Titus* (*Horst*, *Essai sur les sources de la deuxième partie des Actes des Apôtres*: Strasburg, 1849; *Krenkel*, *Paul der Ap der Heiden*: Leipzig, 1869, pp. 214 sq.), whose association with Paul, at least for the time, covered by xvi 10—xx. 4, is also otherwise well attested (Ep. to the Gal. and Epp. to the Cor.). In other respects, however, there is in favour of this hypothesis only the general fact of its possibility,—a possibility which is not excluded by the Acts in so far that Titus is not mentioned therein, while in tradition this hypothesis possesses no foundation, or, if any, only an uncertain one.<sup>2</sup> Entirely without foundation in tradition, and

<sup>1</sup> Here we may hold entirely aloof from the contest against the *Luke* hypothesis in its traditional form, in which it rests on the supposition of the identity of the author of the Acts and of the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  sections, and in which it is no doubt for the most part exclusively combatted (vide, for example, *Schwanbeck*, pp 125 sqq , who (p 152) only touches very cursorily on Gfrorer's view). The argument which the opponents of the *Luke* hypothesis usually draw from the silence observed in the Epistle to the Philippians with regard to Luke (*Schwanbeck*, p. 131; *Bleek*, Einl. p 330), is at all events removed by the remarks (p. 46 supra) respecting the alleged Macedonian standpoint of the memoir with regard to xvi. 8—xx. 3. Cf further, *Zeller*, pp. 454 sq

<sup>2</sup> When, in support of his hypothesis, Krenkel appeals to the Cretan address of the spurious Epistle to Titus (Tit. 1. 5), the arguments on which he bases his opinion are very questionable, considering the doubtfulness of the usual assumption that the first person plural in xxvii. 1, 2, exclusively denotes Paul and the narrator (vide, on the other hand, xx 18). Moreover, taking Krenkel's assumption respecting the author of the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  source as granted, the author of the Epistle to Titus, with his supposition that Titus had remained behind in Crete, would at all events contradict the tradition respecting that source. The remaining quotations adduced by Krenkel from the Pastoral Epistles in favour of his hypothesis, are themselves based on extremely problematical assumptions as to a partial genuineness of these Epistles. The question should rather be, whether, assuming the silence of the Acts with regard to Titus to be intentional,—as Horst at least recognizes it to be, p. 18,—such an employment of the source, as we find made in the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  sections of the Acts, renders the theory attributing the authorship of the source to none other than Titus himself, very probable.

encumbered with difficulties besides, is the assumption, otherwise sharing the advantage of the *Titus* hypothesis, that Timothy was the author of the memoir. The principal interest of this hypothesis,<sup>1</sup> which has found acceptance through Schleiermacher's lectures on the Acts (cf. his Einl. p. 354), is attached to its original fundamental conception of the difference which the ήμεῖς sections present between the author of the Acts and the author of the source.<sup>2</sup> Under all the circumstances, however, this hypothesis cannot escape attributing to the author of the Acts at the passage, xx. 4, 5, a procedure of, to say the least, a very artificial character; and, at least so far as concerns that solution of the problem of the ήμεῖς sections which explains the retention of the ήμεῖς as being intentional, it must be regarded as quite improbable that the author of the Acts has again named in his work, and thereby distinguished from himself, the person whose character he has in the ήμεῖς sections himself assumed (cf. *Zeller*, p. 458).<sup>3</sup> Of all these hypotheses, however, the most groundless is that attributing the authorship of the Pauline memoir to Silas. If we separate this assumption from the connection which it has, in Schwanbeck's case, in conjunction with his wholly untenable views respecting the composition of the Acts in general, then there is an absence of every ground of suspicion of it in the text of the ήμεῖς sections and of the Acts generally (against it, cf. *Zeller*, pp. 453 sqq.; *Lekebusch*, pp. 168 sqq.; *Oertel*, pp. 15 sqq., and others); and even without Silas

<sup>1</sup> For its champions see *De Wette* (supra, p. 32), to whom has been recently added *Beyschlag*.

<sup>2</sup> When, therefore, *Schneckenburger* (p. 17) speaks of a "Timothy crotchet," the expression is perfectly correct, at least as regards that form which the *Timothy* hypothesis takes in the hands of Mayerhoff. Against his views see, besides *De Wette*, supra, p. 32, *Schwanbeck*, pp. 164 sqq., and *Strauss*, *Charakterist. u. Krit.* pp. 286 sqq. Here, against this hypothesis, the passage xx. 4, 5, is quite decisive.

<sup>3</sup> What further is adduced against the *Timothy* hypothesis by its opponents (*Zell.* pp. 453 sqq.; *Lekeb.* pp. 140 sqq.; *Oert.* pp. 8 sqq. &c.), adds nothing important to the proof against it; and in particular the appeal to the Macedonian standpoint of the source for the period covered by xvi. 18—xx. 4 (which also occurs in *Zeller*, p. 459), must here again be rejected. Cf. supra, p. 46.

being taken as the author of the entire book of the Acts (*Hennel*, *Unters. über den Ursprung des Christenthums*, p. 104, der deutsch. Ausg. ; where, moreover, Luke is identified with Silvanus ; against which see *Schneckenburger*, p. 38), there is, in particular, the fact against it of the omission of the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\sigma$ s in the narrative, xvi. 18 sqq. (*Bleek*, Einl. p. 331).

### 2b.—b). OTHER SOURCES OF THE BOOK.

Cf. *Zeller*, pp. 489 sqq. (where older attempts are met); *Lekebusch*, pp. 402 sqq.; *Ewald*, pp. 36 sqq. Of traces of a *written* source in the text of the Acts, the only certain *direct* example, consisting as it does in the *form* of the narrative, is found in the  $\eta\mu\epsilon\sigma$ s sections ; nor can the references to the contrary, made by De Wette in particular, be maintained. Starting from the general probability, recognized (though only for the first part of the Acts) by Schneckenburger also, p. 156, that the author did use written sources, De Wette adduced the following considerations as testimony in favour of such use :

(1) “The interpolated letters, xv. 23—29; xxiii. 26—30.” But against the authenticity of the latter we have spoken elsewhere ; and as regards the former, its authenticity stands or falls with the historical possibility of the narrative, xv. 1—33, and that a doubt might arise from xv. 29 was acknowledged here by De Wette himself.

(2) The *speeches* in the Acts. De Wette himself was not altogether unaware of the extreme questionability of this point. His words were : “Against the complete verbal accuracy of the speeches of the Apostles and other persons, many things no doubt tell ; for example—(a) The improbability that they were taken down or noted immediately after their delivery by hearers. (b) Frequent incongruities not only in their contents (i. 18 sq. 22 ; v. 36 ; x. 28, 37 ; xiii. 39 ; xvii. 31 ; xx. 25 ; xxvi. 20), but also in expression (xviii. 6 ; xx. 26, 27). (c) Thoughts and turns

which recur in the speeches of different persons (ii. 25 sqq., cf. xiii. 34; ii. 39, iii. 35 sq., cf. xiii. 26; iii. 18, cf. xiii. 27; iii. 17 sqq., cf. xvii. 30; v. 20, cf. xiii. 26; x. 40, cf. xvii. 31; i. 8, 22; ii. 32; iii. 15; v. 32; x. 39, 41, cf. xiii. 31; i. 10, 16; ii. 14, 22; iii. 12; v. 35; vii. 2; xiii. 16, 26; xvii. 22; xxii. 1). (d) The author's peculiarities of expression which run through all the speeches (*Mayerh.* pp. 225 sqq.). Since, however, not only individual thoughts (xx. 33 sqq.), but partly also the course and scheme (vii. 2 sqq.; xvii. 22 sqq.), are peculiar and adapted to the persons and circumstances, and since the simple unsophisticated narrator cannot be supposed to have possessed the high degree of historic art which would be involved in the independent composition of such speeches (*Eichhorn*, Einl. ii. 38 sq.), he must at least have employed written materials." But the art which De Wette scruples to ascribe to the author, most clearly discloses itself precisely in the speeches which are put in the mouth of the principal personages in the Acts, and that too, even if for other reasons we had to regard the author of the book as a "simple unsophisticated narrator." But in substance, Eichhorn has at all events already decided the question respecting these speeches :

(a) They *give prominence* to the characteristic culminating points of the narrative, and in this respect they are spread over the narrative in the most artistic manner (see the proofs, *supra*, p. 10).

(b) They are in part inseparably bound up with the historical tradition of the Acts,—this being the case not simply with xi. 1—18 (a mere excerpt from ch. x.), but also with xv. 7, and particularly with ch. xxii. xxiv. and xxvi.

(c) Even the speeches (ch. vii. 17, 20) marked by De Wette as conspicuous in the Acts for their peculiarity, serve rather to characterize the situations to which they belong, in a manner not indeed historical, but characteristically enough for the Acts (the only exception being perhaps in the case of the polemic against the building of the Temple, vii. 47 sqq.), and are most

intimately bound up with the drift and scheme of the book.<sup>1</sup> With so much the more weight do the considerations against the genuineness of the apostolic speeches, adduced by De Wette himself, and which admit of being considerably strengthened, now fall into the scale (cf. also *Zeller*, pp. 496 sqq.). The most recent attempt, too, in the way of apology in regard to the speeches of the Acts abandons the defence of the authenticity of all,<sup>2</sup> and confines itself to that of the Petrine addresses, that in xi. 1—18 excepted (*Weiss*, petr. Lehrbeg. 1855 *passim*, and Lehrb. der Bibl. Theol., Berlin, 1868, pp. 117 sqq.). The original character claimed for the latter is based on their peculiarity of language and their affinity to the first Epistle of Peter. The proof, however, is quite illusory, since Weiss himself is unable entirely to deny the Lucan character of the language even of the speeches of Peter, and since their partial peculiarity in point of their vocabulary is completely explained by the peculiarity of their contents, while their alleged affinity to the first Petrine Epistle is so superficial, that, granting the genuineness of that Epistle, it cannot fail here to excite the strongest prejudice<sup>3</sup> To the doc-

<sup>1</sup> The literary art bestowed on the speeches in the Acts is also especially evidenced in the minor touches with which the author is able to furnish them for the purpose of characterizing them. Cf. the number stated in xi. 12; the formula of quotation, xiii. 33; the familiar *Συμεών*, xv. 14; the character given to the speech of the orator, xxiv. 3 sqq.; the different language of the speeches, ch. xxii. and xxvi., and in general the high degree of purpose displayed in the arrangement of the speeches, ch. vii., xxii., xxiv., xxvi., and particularly in the speech at Athens, ch. xvii.

<sup>2</sup> Such a defence of all the speeches is naturally excluded, at least by v. 34—39; xi. 1—18; xix. 35—41, and it is self-evident also that there are no general grounds against the invention of speeches in a writing which makes so artistic a use of free forms of narration as the Acts, e. g. xxiii. 18 sqq.; xxv. 14 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> What the spirit of Weiss's publication is, let a few samples show. Among the Petrine speeches he classifies even i. 24, 25; iv. 24—30; and v. 29—32, and even in the case of such small speeches as vi. 2—4; xii. 11, this writer does not hesitate to decide respecting their authenticity (*vide p. 83*). Again, *ἰδιος*, i. 25, is alleged to be used as an expression of Peter's on account of 1 Pet. iii. 1—5; *γνωστὸν γίγνεσθαι* or *εἶναι* does not occur in Luke's Gospel at all, but is found nine times in the Acts—the first three times in Petrine speeches. And so Luke will no doubt "have adopted it from his source" (*p. 76*). Six times Peter calls himself and the Apostles witnesses (*μάρτυρες*) of the facts of the life of Jesus. The Apostle will probably have adopted this mode of expression from the charge of Jesus, i. 8; Luke xxiv. 48, and Luke will have transferred the Petrine expression to Paul (Acts xxii. 15; xxvi. 16) in order to

trial discourses of Peter in the Acts (ii. 14 sqq.; iii. 12 sqq.), we may in a certain sense grant that they faithfully represent the primitive preaching of the Messiah by the Apostles, and that so far they possess a certain originality (*vide Holsten, Zum Evangel. des Paul. u. des Petr.* pp. 147 sq.). But the matter is explained very simply from the fact that these speeches are but very indirectly connected with the special aims of the Acts as regards their principal contents. They are said to be samples of the oldest apostolic preaching among the Jews; and, according to what has been laid down above respecting the aim and tendency of the Acts, there would be no obstacle to the Acts on the whole reproducing this preaching in the form in which, according to other traces, we may conjecture it to have been really

put him on a level with the Twelve Apostles; while *μάρτυς*, xxii. 20, is manifestly used already to denote martyrs. This house of cards is crowned by the assertion that this style of expression in the Petrine speeches strikingly agrees with the *μάρτυς τῶν Χριστοῦ παθημάτων*, 1 Pet v i.—while it is at least equally surprising that, in the Acts, the Apostles are never spoken of as witnesses of the sufferings, but always of the facts, of Christ's life in general, or of his resurrection in particular. The "counter test" likewise, which Weiss is skilful enough to extract in favour of his results from the speech, xi. 1—18, discloses a strange capacity for twisting an interpretation. To be sure, this speech is said to have been written by Luke, but it is said on that account to be entirely in his style, and without any trace of the "Petrinisms" found in the other speeches of Peter (p. 83). But, even if we completely grant this, how is it possible to escape seeing the palpable fallacy which must follow from this direct comparison of the language of a narrative speech with doctrinal discourses which by reason of their contents cannot but have less in common with the rest of the text! Whoever considers the facts here without prejudice, will rather find it very natural that the first narrative speech of Peter occurring in the Acts, exhibits the style of the book without the slightest ambiguity, and from this manifest case he will acquire a clue whereby to judge the other speeches whose inferior clearness is due to the subject itself. But the entire argument is directly traversed by Weiss when he assumes an Aramaic original for the Petrine speeches. This point the older apologetic interpreters in their naivete sometimes forgot (for example, *Seyler*), but with the more recent writers of this class it has become a postulate. It is of course incapable of being proved. For the fact that all the speeches in the Acts were originally written in Greek, follows, particularly in the case of the Petrine speeches, from their relation to the Septuagint; and the traces which some have been persuaded they have discovered of their primitive Aramaic form are founded on error (*vide infra*, pp. 59 sq.). Still, granting that this were otherwise, yet it is certainly pardonable if we look with some mistrust on the tortuous nature of the proof which, by help of the Greek Epistle, professes to recognize Peter's style of expression in speeches which in their Greek form are said not to be by Peter at all.

carried on, and in which it continued to exercise its influence till the time of Justin, namely, as written proof of the Messiahship of Jesus. Nothing at all can be proved for the Petrine speeches by their Christology, for that is not peculiar to them (cf. xiii. 27 sqq.; xvii. 31), while it is shown generally by the Pauline speech (xiii. 16 sqq.) in particular that nothing is further from the purpose of the Acts itself than a design to represent the speeches in ch. ii. and iii. as of a specifically Petrine (or primitive apostolic) character. The relation of these speeches to the *ταπονοία* also is an argument against their originality. Add to this that these Petrine speeches, too, by no means entirely lack more special references to the peculiar historical narrative of the Acts. Such references, on the contrary, appear in their Anti-Judaism (cf. ii. 23) and in the universalistic announcements in ii. 39; iii. 26 sqq.—passages which would be decisive as to the literary origin of the Petrine speeches only in case their tradition in a written form, antecedent to the Acts, were otherwise established, which, however, is by no means the case.<sup>1</sup>

Further, De Wette adduced: (3) Traces of different accounts. (a) “Ch. xiii. xiv. appear to be derived from a memoir of the author’s own; xix. 16 refers to something omitted in the source; xxi. 10 does not appear to presuppose xi. 28, vide Com. on xxi. 8.” However, the assumption of a special written source, supposed to be preserved in ch. xiii. xiv., has been disproved in the commentary on those chapters, and in regard to the question, what elements of this narrative may be referred to earlier written notices, see further, *infra*, p. 62. The passage, xix. 16, would not in any case require us to suppose too unusual an employment of the source to permit us to draw a safe conclusion. And as re-

<sup>1</sup> The most recent defences of the authenticity of even the Pauline speeches in the Acts,—defences in which, however, the form of those speeches is for the most part given up,—aa, for example, in *Lekebusch*, pp. 332 sqq.; *Lechler*, pp. 140 sqq.; *Oertel*, pp. 69 sqq.; *Trip*, pp. 189 sqq., and others, do not, after what has been already said, and after the preliminary remarks on these speeches, require any further refutation. In substance their authenticity is abandoned in *Oort. Specim. Theol. quo inquiritur in orationum quae in Act. App. Paulo tribuuntur, indolem Paulinam*; *Lugd. Bat. 1862*.

gards xxi. 10, see also our Commentary.<sup>1</sup> (b) "From the fact that in the first part of the Acts the history of Peter is specially prominent, and something is told of him in ch. xii. which does not clearly fit in with the pragmatical connection, Ziegler and Heinr. Bleek (*Einl.* pp. 335 sq.) have inferred the employment of a connected history of this Apostle; and the probability remains in favour of this conjecture in spite of the adverse remarks of Schneckenburger, pp. 157 sq., that 'the prominent appearance of Peter is founded partly in history itself and partly in the plan of Luke; even ch. xii. fits in with this plan (*vide* the note); special history of individual Apostles, like Peter, are inconceivable in the apostolic age, because his activity was not isolated from that of the rest of the Apostles; not till later, when party aims were to be attained by it, could such a writing be thought of.' (?)'" But the possibility of a Petrine document lying at the foundation of the first part of the Acts must at all events be established in a different way from that in which De Wette proposes (*vide infra*), and it is correct, as Schneckenburger remarks, that not a single Petrine narrative in the Acts is so foreign to the connection of the book that it could only be explained by the influence of an extrinsic source (*vide supra*, p. 24). (c) "At all events, considering the uniformity in other respects of the style of writing and choice of words, peculiarities of language are observable which are to be regarded as remnants and traces of the sources employed. As for instance:

(a) "The Hebraic colouring of the style in the first part." However, the careful investigations of Mayerhoff, *loc. cit.*, Zel-

<sup>1</sup> Against the traces of a source which some writers thought they had discovered in i. 13 and xiii. 9, cf. Com. on these passages. Such traces have been pursued with particular ardour by *Bleek* (*vide* especially *Einl.* pp. 327 sqq.), but such points as we have not noticed above refute themselves. The differences in the parallel narratives, ix. 1—19; xxii. 6—21; xxvi. 10—18, have also been held to betray various sources (*vide*, in opposition to these views, the Com.). *Ewald*, p. 37, and *Meyer*, on viii. 4, are led, by the resumption at xi. 19 of the subject mentioned at viii. 4, to attribute the intervening portion to another source,—a theory which is disposed of by the correct view of the composition of this section (*cf.* further xvi. 4); xix. 33 is surprising (xvii. 5 even being different). However, this passage, too, only permits the inference of a written source in a very doubtful manner.

ler, pp. 498 sqq., and Lekebusch, pp. 37 sqq., 402 sqq., have demonstrated the unity of the Acts in point of style in all its parts, and established that in this direction generally the discovery of any supposed sources of the Acts is without any prospect of success. The essential uniformity, especially of the language employed in the first and second parts of the Acts, is established, and the point here in question at any rate (as *De Wette*, Einl. in das N. T., § 115 c, Note b, acknowledged) is merely a relative difference, for the explanation of which the peculiar contents of the first part of the Acts completely suffice (*Lekebusch*, p. 104).

(β) "Probable errors in translation, ii. 24, 33; v. 31." These, which were first asserted by Bleek, and which have recently been increased by Weiss, by the addition of iii. 26; v. 20; viii. 21, and x. 36 sq., have all been refuted in the commentary on the respective passages.

(γ) "παῖς θεοῦ, used of Jesus in iii. 13, 26; iv. 27, 30, and used of David in iv. 25; διὰ στόματος Δανιὴλ, τῶν προφητῶν, in i. 16; iii. 18, 21; iv. 25; οἱ νῦν Ἰσρ., v. 21; ἡ γερουσίᾳ, ib.; ὁ ἵερεύς, v. 24; ἥγαγεν, xiii. 23; πρὸ προσώπου, xiii. 24; Συμεών, instead of Σίμων, xv. 14; ἡ ὁδός, used of the Christian religion, ix. 2; xix. 9, 23; xxiv. 22; διαλέγεσθαι, xvii. 2, 17; xviii. 4, 19; xix. 8, sq.; xx. 7, 9; xxiv. 12, 25; ἐπὶ, of duration of time, not only in x. 16, xi. 10 (*ἐπὶ τρίσ*), but also in xiii. 31; xvi. 18; xvii. 2; xviii. 20; xix. 8, 10, 34; xx. 9, 11; xxiv. 4; xxvii. 26; xxviii. 6 (*Bleek*)."  
In regard, however, to these expressions, the objections against them are, that in some cases they are spread over too various parts of the Acts for us to regard them as characteristic traces of a source—for example, ἡ ὁδός, διαλέγεσθαι, and ἐπὶ, of duration. In some cases again they are rather to be ascribed to the literary art of the author of the Acts (*Συμεών*, xv. 14, vide *Zeller*, p. 519, and *supra*, p. 56), while in other cases they can also be pointed out in other parts of Luke's writings, e. g. παῖς used of Israel and David, Luke i. 54, 69 [cf. also for the addition of ἄγιος, Luke iv. 34, and the passage from the Psalms, Acts ii. 27 and xiii. 35];

*διὰ στόματος*, Luke i. 70; Acts xv. 7; and *στόμα*, Luke i. 64; Acts viii. 35; x. 34; xviii. 14; xxii. 14. And such expressions are found in passages which, in other respects at least, too clearly bear the stamp of Luke's own style (cf. Zeller, p. 505). With what may possibly remain after these deductions, no one will attempt to prove anything. Finally, De Wette considered the supposition of written sources for the Acts to have been favoured (§) "by the hints of the author's in the preface to the first part of his work, and his method of procedure in writing it;" but, in opposition to this view, De Wette himself referred to Credner, Einl. ins. N. T., § 107. His opinion, moreover, is refuted by the exclusive reference of the prologue, Luke i. 1—4, to the Gospel (vide supra, p. 6). Accordingly we might rather conclude from the difference of the prologue to the Acts (i. 1 sq.) that, in the case of this second book, the author was differently situated with regard to sources.<sup>1</sup>

By the above considerations it is by no means absolutely disputed that the author of the Acts may have employed written sources in those parts of his book which are not covered by the *ημεῖς* source. Indeed, the probability of such having been the case is the greater, the later we assume the Acts to have been written (cf. § 3). But it results from all that has hitherto been said in § 2a and § 2b, that any sources employed in writing the Acts have been handled with such freedom, that they can only be arrived at by means of the contents of the several narratives, in accordance with the canon laid down by Zeller, p. 500, namely, that "the more visibly a speech or narrative exhibits the peculiar standpoint of our author and serves the peculiar purpose of his treatise, and the less the probability at the same

<sup>1</sup> Schneckenburger (p. 161) fancied that the account in the Acts respecting the primitive Church might be based upon information that Luke had gathered in Caesarea through Philip and his family (xxi. 8 sq.). Against this notion, which is on no condition tenable, though adopted in the main by Lekebusch (p. 413), De Wette objected that "even if this man (Philip), like his prophetic daughters, might have viewed the earlier history of the Church in a prophetic fantastic light, yet it could hardly be expected that he would have represented his own experiences in the form in which they are given in viii. 39."

time of its having been handed down in a historically faithful form, so much the more is there in favour of the assumption that it originates with our author; and, on the other hand, the less it admits of being explained from the points of view just mentioned, the more are we compelled to have recourse to other sources." Owing to the nature of the question, only rough general results are to be arrived at in this way. The critical remarks in the Commentary on the several narratives may, however, be here collected and reduced to the following general assumptions, which in substance agree with Zeller's exposition (pp. 500 sqq.). The dependence of the Acts on older tradition—perhaps on an older description—is probably greatest in the Petrine narratives (ch. i.—v.; ix. 31—xi. 18; xii. 1—33), because the latter are most directly related to the leading aim of the book, and in the connection of the Acts least admit of being explained by free invention. More especially would the narratives of miracles seem to belong to these portions of the Petrine legend which apparently must form the preliminary condition to the peculiar parallelism between Peter and Paul that runs through the narrative of the Acts (cf. *Zeller*, pp. 507 sq.). In these narratives, however, there are not wanting portions which are too directly bound up with the connection of the Acts to allow any escape from the necessity of placing them preponderatingly, in accordance with the canon before mentioned, to the account of the author of the Acts. (This is the case to the greatest extent with the Cornelius episode, x. 1—xi. 18.) Any more definite view with regard to the source probably lying at the foundation of the passages quoted does not, however, admit of being established. That such a source was specially devoted to the person of the Apostle Peter is very possible, but for asserting it as a fact we have no warrant; and especially must we leave the question undecided whether this source was the Judaistic *κήρυγμα Πέτρου* (*Volkmar*, Rel. Jesu, p. 282). Nay, this may even be doubted at least in so far as the contents of that work, according to the glimpse we still have of it in Clem.

Recogn. i. 22, 40 sqq., are wanting in more special points of contact with the narrative of the Acts (*Zeller*, p. 509). Nor is it possible to decide the question how much of the episode of the Hellenists (vi. 1—8, 40; xi. 19—26) may perhaps have belonged to the same source as the Petrine narratives, or to another.<sup>1</sup> In general we can assert no more than that this entire episode stands far less in need of the assumption of an earlier tradition in order to explain it, because it is much more closely and intimately connected with the aim of the Acts. The safest assumption is that viii. 9—24 was supported by a given and tolerably well-developed tradition. A most complete explanation, however, is afforded by the very context of the Acts itself in regard to everything which in the first part directly refers to Paul, vii. 58 sq.; viii. 1, 3; ix. 1—30; xi. 22—30; xii. 25; and here at any rate, as can be shown from other sources, the author has made a very free use of his prerogative with respect to tradition. To this freedom he adheres also in the second or exclusively Pauline portion of his book, and in the first place in ch. xiii. and xiv., in which, speaking generally, only the itinerary of Paul's journey requires the support of earlier tradition to explain it. And, indeed, taking as granted the view set forth in § 3 respecting the time when the Acts was written, such a tradition must at least have come to the author's knowledge, probably already in some written form.<sup>2</sup> Ch. xv. belongs at all events to the most independent fictions of the Acts. The rest of the narrative, except the ημεῖς sections, gives no occasion for conjecturing a written source. The peculiar application of the source forming the basis of these sections has been set forth above (pp. 43 sqq.). According to that account, it probably

<sup>1</sup> The way in which *Ewald*, pp. 36 sqq., refers the different groups of narratives in the first part of the Acts to different sources in each case is perfectly arbitrary.

<sup>2</sup> Notwithstanding what was assumed above (p. 43) respecting the beginning of the ημεῖς source, it might be regarded as already the basis for the journeys in ch. xiii. and xiv., since it is possible that that source, perhaps by way of introduction, gave a sketch of the Pauline journeys of the period previous to the reporter's taking part in them.

covers also the details—resting, as may be conjectured, upon extrinsic sources—of the narrative, ch. xvi.—xxviii. (For the particulars, vide supra, p. 50). At least, according to the view stated above respecting the compass of this source, there is no reason, with Zeller (pp. 520 sq.), to look about any further after another source for the second and third missionary journeys of Paul.<sup>1</sup>

### 3.—TRUSTWORTHINESS ; TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING ; PERSON OF THE AUTHOR

A historical book which, like the Acts, subjects its materials to so artificial and arbitrary an arrangement (vide § 1*a*), which so strongly modifies them in the direction of its particular aims (§ 1*b*), and which has likewise handled its sources with so much freedom (§ 2*a* and *b*), is in general untrustworthy, and has to prove its trustworthiness for each special case. Now De Wette did not indeed defend the complete historical trustworthiness of the Acts, but he nevertheless thought himself bound to charge Baur and Schrader with having “cast unwarrantable suspicion” on it, and Baur in particular with having represented the historical contents of the Acts “as consisting for the most part of free fiction.” It is, according to De Wette, the second part of the Acts which bears “the stamp of history to the largest ex-

<sup>1</sup> The question as to the relation in which the author of the Acts stands to the Pauline Epistles does not in strictness belong here, and dealing with it in connection with the question as to the sources of the Acts (as is the case with Zeller, p 519), even conceals the characteristic fact that the Pauline Epistles, so far as it is still possible to make out, do *not* belong to the sources of the Acts. No doubt the author knew at all events the genuine Epistles of Paul still extant. This is self-evident in the case of a writer whose work betrays an interest, so intense in its way, in Paul and Paulinism, at the time when the Acts is conjectured to have been written (vide § 3); and the knowledge he had of them also comes out in ix. 19—30 : xv. 1—33, and probably also in xviii. 24—28. But nowhere does the Acts make use of any Pauline letter known to us in the sense of employing it as a source—the case of ix. 25 is too isolated to be so understood—and it is indeed very significant that the Acts never directly takes notice of the Epistles of Paul, except to contradict them (ix. 19 sqq.), and to substitute for their contents something different (xv. 1 sqq.), or, from its own point of view, to explain some difference with them (xviii. 24 sqq.).

tent," "although many reports (there) are destitute of foundation in observation and information at first hand" (*2a*). "The first part, on the contrary, contains accounts which are derived not from the original source, but from tradition (cf. i. 19). From such causes in part arise cases of insoluble difficulties (ii. 4 sqq.; v. 1 sqq.), exaggeration (ii. 45; iv. 34), incorrectness (ix. 19 sqq., cf. Gal. i. 17 sq.), ambiguity (xi. 30; xii. 25), and insufficiency (ix. 30); hence also the large element of the marvellous, which, however, to some extent appears to be attributable to the mind (subjectivity) of the author or of his informant (viii. 39; xii. 23), and which in some cases presents itself with deviations (cf. ch. xxii., xxvi., and particularly xxii. 9, with ix. 9; and xxii. 17 sqq. with ix. 29 sq.). There are evident traces of unacquaintance with Jewish history and custom (v. 36 sq.; x. 28)."

The distinction here drawn between the first and second part of the Acts has, indeed, something correct at its foundation. From what has been argued in § 2*a* and *b* on the sources of the Acts, it results that the untrustworthiness of the first part of the Acts is due partly to the nature or condition of its sources, while, in the second part it is more exclusively attributable to the mode in which they have been employed; or—what amounts to the same thing—in the first part of the Acts, in judging of its trustworthiness, the influence of legend must be taken into consideration, while in the second part, so far as can be gathered, we have to consider only the bias of the writer.<sup>1</sup> So far then the untrustworthiness of the first part of the Acts may be declared rather considerable, inasmuch as the sources are here affected, while the sources of the Pauline part of the book, so far as they can be identified, are even classical. However, the systematic unity of the Acts (vide § 1*b*) of itself forbids an absolutely sharp distinction to be drawn here between the first and second parts, since neither of them is founded exclusively upon extrinsic sources. The Petrine

<sup>1</sup> That this is the case is most directly observable in the narratives of marvels occurring in the Acts, of which those connected with Peter probably rest on tradition, while those referred to Paul are probably attributable to intentional copying.

part contains narratives that are only to be explained from the context of the Acts, while the Pauline part is not entirely free from unintentional mistakes (e. g. probably xvii. 23). This part too, according to De Wette himself, in the passages xxii. 6 sqq. and xxvii. 12 sqq., shares all the difficulties of the narrative ix. 1 sqq. Again (what De Wette did not observe), xxii. 17 shares in the error of ix. 19 sqq., while xxi. 20 discloses hardly less exaggerated representations of the relations of primitive Christianity, and the passage xv. 1—33 does not at all events stand in a different relation to the Epistle to the Galatians than that occupied by ix. 1—30 in the first part.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, it is owing to the acknowledged difference between the first and second parts of the Acts that it is impossible to draw with any distinctness anything more than the limits which circumscribe the credibility of the Pauline part, as there are hardly any criteria to assist us beyond this. In this part everything without qualification is trustworthy which, within the limits fixed by the references above, pp. 43 sqq., is covered by the memoir of Paul's travelling companion which the author has made use of; that is, besides some few notices mentioned above (see pp. 50 sq.), the itinerary of Paul's journeys, ch. xvi.—xxviii. Even this, however, owing to the peculiar application which has been made of the source in question in the Acts, is open to a doubt, in the first place in regard to its completeness, for which it offers no guarantee in the portions where the *ημεῖς* source is dropped.<sup>2</sup> Further, it is

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps also in xxi. 26 there is an example of the author's unacquaintance with Jewish customs. At all events, according to the assumptions usually accepted respecting the original character of the first part of the Acts, it cannot at least fail to surprise us to see such proofs turning up precisely in the first part of the work. The examples adduced by De Wette belong no doubt rather to narratives which are the characteristic property of the Acts.

<sup>2</sup> Hence the assumption of journeys of Paul having been passed over in these parts is not plainly impossible, although, considering the interest which the Acts manifests in the itinerary of Paul, partly by the peculiar application of the *ημεῖς* source, partly in the portions entirely independent of it (ch. xiii. xiv.), or only indirectly dependent on it (xvii. 1—xx. 4), the assumption of journeys having been passed over in the Acts, at least in the case of the section xvi. 1—xxi. 16, is not without difficulty, and in this particular case is perhaps not admissible without the additional supposition of a special purpose on the part of the author.

distorted most probably through the particular interest the author took in Paul's journeys to Jerusalem. Apart, however, from the itinerary, all the narratives in ch. xvi.—xxviii. are much too closely bound up with the peculiar connection of the Acts not to be, in the measure of this connection, either, all of them, doubted or altogether rejected. The analogy of the narrative xvi. 1—xxi. 16 in particular may, however, justify our referring the itinerary of Paul's journeys in ch. xiii. xiv. too to trustworthy tradition. Nevertheless, it is impossible to escape seeing that here this part of the narrative of the Acts is far more cursorily treated than xvi. 1—xxi. 16. If the data in xviii. 11; xix. 8, 15; xx. 3, permit at least an approximate chronological estimate of the so-called second and third missionary journeys of Paul to be formed from the Acts itself, yet for the journeys in ch. xiii. xiv. such data are entirely wanting; and for the entire period of Paul's life embraced by ch. ix.—xiv., only in xi. 26 is there a single datum afforded. At all events, the reader can have no suspicion of this period having been of seventeen years' duration (according to Gal. i. 18; ii. 1). But precisely this is a fact which can hardly be regarded as accidental or as only due to extrinsic causes,—the sources, for instance,—the less so because the impression that this period has been cut short does not even depend chiefly on the passage in which the arbitrary way the chronology has been dealt with can be most directly proved. For at any rate the three years mentioned in Gal. i. 18 have been contracted by the author in ix. 19—25. But, by lengthening the fifteen days mentioned in Gal. loc. cit., Acts ix. 26—30, the contraction of the former period is to a certain extent balanced. So the unprejudiced reader can have no conception that the period comprised in the narrative ix. 1—30 lasted three years, but still less has he the impression that the narrative ix. 20—xiv. 28 extended over a period of fourteen years. If now we consider the importance of the narrative ch. xv., by which, according to the Acts, the work of Paul as an Apostle in the countries of the Gentiles first receives its final sanction, the con-

jecture very readily suggests itself that the author abbreviated the fourteen years in ix. 30—xiv. 28 in the interest of an object quite analogous to that affecting the three years in ix. 19—25, and that in particular he did not draw a veil over the duration and thereby over the importance of the journeys in ch. xiii. xiv., for no purpose (cf. *Zeller*, p. 384). Accordingly there is no occasion, indeed, to throw doubt upon the faithfulness of the catalogue of halting-places in Paul's journeys described in ch. xiii. xiv., but the absence in this catalogue of the chronological definiteness of the itinerary, xvi. 1—xxi. 16, is with great probability attributed to the voluntary choice of the author of the Acts, and in this sense less credibility attaches in ch. xiii. xiv. to the outer margin of Paul's apostolic journeys than in the later narrative.

With still less distinctness is it possible to define the limits to the credibility of the first part of the Acts, so far as it does not concern Paul (for the portions concerning him are in part capable of being directly checked). To call this part of the Acts, as Schwegler does (ii 111), a "running fiction," is indeed so far due to misconception as it probably in part rests on older sources (vide *Schwegler* himself, p. 114). Nevertheless, even a sharper distinction in this sense would be of little advantage here to the Acts, in so far as even those portions of the narrative which are with the greatest probability referred to older sources (vide supra, p. 62) betray, as already observed, a strong influence exerted upon them by legend. Still, it must be conceded that, while in those portions of the narrative in which the share of the author of the Acts entirely preponderates (as in the Cornelius episode, and most probably in the entire episode of the Hellenists), it is hardly possible to separate particulars that are historically tenable, yet the Petrine narratives which are most favoured by appearing to be based in part on older tradition, also contain notices which may with the greatest probability lay claim to historical credibility. To this class belong perhaps the election of a substitute for Judas, i. 15 sqq., and

especially the general fact of a persecution of the primitive Church and certain elements of the narrative in ch. xii. (particularly xii. 2). For a more precise critical estimate of details vide the *Commentary*.

The date of the authorship of the Acts is only to be approximately arrived at by reference to tradition and by help of the book itself. It is impossible, at all events, that the assumption should be correct which is founded on the concluding words of the Acts and often defended still, namely, that the book was written before the death of Paul (A.D. 64). This assumption is based on an arbitrary interpretation of the conclusion of the Acts, makes it, generally speaking, completely unintelligible, and contradicts the oldest report respecting the writing of the book, which places the event in the time after the death of Peter and Paul (*Iren.* Adv. Hær. iii. 1, 1). The death of Paul indeed is already presupposed in the Acts, xx. 25; and against the entire opinion here in question as to the date of the Acts, De Wette also referred to his observations on xx. 25 and xxviii. 31. Schneckenburger also acknowledged the facts above stated (pp. 237 sqq.), but he himself considered the Acts to have been written immediately before the destruction of Jerusalem, circa A.D. 69 (pp. 231 sqq.),—an assumption founded partly on an erroneous application of the passage, viii. 26, which, when correctly interpreted, is entirely valueless for the purpose of fixing the date of the Acts in general, and founded partly on the meaning arbitrarily given to the silence of the Acts in regard to the destruction of Jerusalem which had already taken place, and partly on a perverse conception of the standpoint of the entire book in general.<sup>1</sup> On the contrary, it was at any rate after the

<sup>1</sup> The assertion that such an apology of Paul as we have in the Acts was no longer a necessity in the time after the destruction of Jerusalem (p. 283), is based on a strong misconception, especially in the case of Schneckenburger, with regard to the Gentile Christian character of the Acts, aiming to detach the Christian Church nationally from Judaism. It is fundamentally false in Schneckenburger to make the Christians in the Acts attach value to the reputation of being Jewish (p. 282). It is rather to the very opposite of this that the Acts attaches value for the Christians, namely, precisely in its representation of the Christians as the sole true heirs of the

destruction of Jerusalem that the Acts was written, since, though the book itself contains no references to this event, the latter is presupposed in Luke xxi. 20 sqq. Beyond this definition of the date of its authorship, De Wette did not go (cf. also *Reuss*, § 207); and in fact the more definite amplifications of Meyer, Lekebusch (p. 442), Ewald (p. 29), and Renan (*Les Apôtres*, p. xxii), who refuse to come down later than the first decade after the destruction of Jerusalem, are at least without support, and are essentially determined by mere dependence on the untested tradition anent the authorship of the Acts by the disciple of the Apostles, Luke.<sup>1</sup> This tradition, on the contrary, is itself untenable judged by the book itself, which presents the clearest signs of a later (post-apostolic) origin. A book which, like this, has been so

Old Testament revelation (cf. particularly the letter of Barnabas) This point of view appears not simply in the representation the Acts gives of Paul (vide supra, p 27), but also especially in the narratives, as for instance, xviii. 12 sqq.; xix. 23 sqq., whose point is to leave no other solidarity remaining between Jews and Christians than that which depends on their common possession of the Old Testament, that is, the solidarity which was not abolished by the ancient Church in general, and for which the destruction of Jerusalem remained a matter of complete indifference. It is also a very questionable assertion to make, that it cannot possibly have occurred to Luke to represent Paul as so friendly to Jewish interests and worship if Jerusalem and the Temple were still in existence (p 232). On the contrary, it is just before the destruction of Jerusalem that such a representation would be almost inconceivable,—at least in a work in which the *παρονοία* is not considered as coinciding with the impending catastrophe,—and the question rather is, whether, precisely because the destruction of Jerusalem had in many respects deprived the Judaism of the Apostles of its practical importance, the author of the Acts could not go thus far in his representation of Paul, and especially whether it was not precisely the fall of the Temple which enabled the author to represent the Apostles as taking part in the *cultus* of the Temple, while they at the same time discountenance the *building* of the Temple.

<sup>1</sup> It is just as unwarranted to assert that the Eschatological speeches in the Gospel of Luke demand the assumption that that work was written *very soon* after the destruction of Jerusalem (vide, against this view, *Zeller*, pp. 407 sqq.), as it is to suppose that the differences between the account of the Ascension in the Gospel and that in the Acts exclude the possibility of the two writings having had a contemporaneous origin. This, on the contrary, is what is actually probable, considering that the Acts represents itself quite directly as the continuation of the Gospel. How little, if we regard it from the historical point of view occupied by the author of the Acts, the later narrative has a significance in any way excluding the earlier, is seen by the fact that the author does not hesitate, in Acts i. 2, expressly to take up the thread of the Gospel narrative. (Cf. also *Volkmar*, *Evang. Marcion's*, pp. 236 sqq.; and *supra*, pp. 5 sq.)

strongly affected (especially in the first part) by the influence of legend, and in which (especially in the second part) the things it reports upon are made to present themselves in a form so foreign to the facts, either could not but be an example of perfectly meaningless falsification, or it presupposes between its own date and the events that form its subject matter, a length of time to have elapsed which would leave room for the development on the one hand of legend springing up almost without purpose, and on the other hand of circumstances or relations under which the past was subjected to a mode of contemplation that strongly modified it. Most especially does the fact of Paul's being the hero of the Acts, while at the same time the picture given of him there is so strongly distorted, presuppose a history which can hardly have led to such results within the limits of the apostolic age. If now this history also still remains too obscure to admit of the ground there occupied by the Acts being precisely defined, there nevertheless appears to be sufficient ground in the general character or condition of the historical narrative of the Acts for us to come down, in seeking the date of its authorship, to about as late as the external testimony in regard to the third Gospel permits, and therefore (with *Schwegler*, ii. 118, 120, and *Zeller*, p. 481) to keep open for it the second and third decades of the second century.<sup>1</sup> It is most especially the political side of the Acts which presupposes a tolerably advanced maturity and settled condition of affairs in the Christian community, and, in particular, a certain aversion to the internal questions which entirely filled the primitive community and which exclusively concerned its relation to Judaism (cf. *Zeller*, p. 474). In the Acts an understanding of a very complicated nature is represented as having been already arrived at with Judaism. The

<sup>1</sup> An earlier date than this does not follow from the most important testimony in regard to the age of Luke's writings, we mean that of Marcion, since the latter is not met with before A.D. 138. *Volkmar's* determination of the date, 105—110 A.D. (*Relig. Jea.* pp. 291, 346; cf. *Evang. Marcion's*, p. 261) is too restricted and destitute of support. *Hilgenfeld* (*die Evangelien*, p. 224), on account of Marcion, assumes the date to be A.D. 109—110. *Köstlin* (*Synopt. Evv.* p. 290) goes back as far as 90 A.D.

internal dependence of the Church on Judaism and its Law is acknowledged, but so much the wider is the external separation of the Church from communion with the Jews as a nation ; and already with the Roman State authorities some conflicts appear to have taken place,—conflicts which begin to give prominence to the interest of the Church in settling its right position with regard to those authorities, and in securing its recognition in its own peculiar character

This brings it at any rate with great probability into the age of Trajan (obit A.D. 117) at the earliest, and lends the Acts the character of an immediate forerunner of the so-called apologetic literature which flourished particularly in the age of the Antonines. To the same date we are perhaps led by the dogmatic point of view assumed in the Acts generally. This point of view, since, according to what was argued on pp 18 sq. supra, it does not unreservedly coincide with that of the primitive Church, especially with that of its decree, xv 23 sqq., is not so different from that of Justin, as Zeller (pp. 478 sqq.) would make it appear. But since the author places the Apostles under the Law, he can hardly in this question have occupied so sharp a position as Justin (Dial. ch. xlvi.), and have regarded as questionable the admissibility of the observance of the Law under Christianity.<sup>1</sup> A number of additional considerations, though not affording the means of arriving at any more precise determinations of the date of the Acts, nevertheless strengthens the proof of its post-apostolic origin. Firstly, its mode of regarding the *παροντά*, the time of which, in common with Luke's Gospel, it leaves indefinite ; and just as this Gospel dissolves the connection of the *παροντά* with the historical event of the destruction of Jerusalem, so does the Acts disconnect it with that of the communication of the Spirit. Further, to these additional proofs belong the traces of the incipient hierarchical constitution of the Church (i. 17, 20 ; viii. 14 sqq.; xv. 28; xx. 17, 28) and of Gnosticism (xx. 29), cf. Zeller,

<sup>1</sup> The inference too that the Mosaic Law is meant in the phrase, *σκληροκάρδιον τοῦ λαοῦ*, of Justin's on Acts vii. 38 ; xv. 20, 21, can hardly be defended.

pp. 474 sqq. The passage xx. 29 cannot well be imagined as directed against anything else but Gnosticism, and the sharpness of the polemic in this passage may possibly no doubt presuppose that the phenomenon combatted already had a certain importance, while the want of any reference to it in the rest of the *Acts* might be due to the form of the book (in opposition to *Zeller's* view, p. 477). This, however, if we accept the view, to be defended below, respecting the home of the *Acts*, by no means brings us down to a time later than that already indicated.

The question as to the *place where the Acts was written*,—a question left entirely untouched by De Wette both here and in the Introduction, § 116 (but see Einl. § 102),—coincides, if we assume the post-apostolic origin of the book, with the question as to its destination, and, apart, the two questions cannot be dealt with, whatever standpoint be taken up (cf. also *Schneckenburger*, p. 241). With regard to tradition, just as it here affords no assistance at all directly in reference to the *Acts*,—for the testimony of Jerome (Catal. 7) does not pretend to be more than a conjecture of the writer,—so in regard to the third Gospel it is entirely unreliable in reference to the place of its origin. If we may entirely waive the consideration of the signatures which are attached in the more recent Biblical MSS. to the third Gospel, and which vary (*Tischendorf*, N. T. edit. viii. crit. maj. p. 738) between Alexandria (this occurring in most of them), Attica ('Αττικὴ τῆς Βοιωτίας, 293), Macedonia and Rome, then the tradition of the *Acts* having been written in Achaia, Attica or Greece, which is defended by Gregory of Nazianzen, Jerome (præf. in Matth.) and Isidore (Hisp.), is in general too late and of too problematic an origin to be of any importance in the question at all (vide *Zeller*, p. 482). But among the hypotheses founded on Luke's writings themselves, that of Jerome (Catal. 7), which represents them as having been written at Rome, still remains the most generally accepted. This hypothesis is adhered to, in common with Jerome, by the commentators who base the date of the authorship of the *Acts* on the concluding words of the book, and in

this form it requires no further refutation here. It has, however, recently been defended in other quarters, particularly by Schneckenburger, pp. 241 sqq.; Zeller, pp. 487 sqq.; Lekebusch, pp. 430 sqq.; and Ewald, pp. 36, 40.<sup>1</sup> The most weighty arguments which have been adduced in favour of it are as follow:

(a) That the author elucidates the affairs and geography of Palestine (Luke i. 26; iv. 31; viii. 26; xxiii. 51; xxiv. 13; Acts i. 12; xxiii. 8); of Macedonia (xvi. 12); of Athens (xvii. 21); and Crete (xxvii. 8; xii. 16); while in xxviii. 12, 13, 15, the knowledge of the geography is presupposed (such are the statements, after older writers, of *De Wette*, Einl. § 102; Schneckenburger, pp. 241 sq.; *Lekebusch*, p. 433; *Ebrard*, *Wiss. Krit. der Evangel. Gesch.*, § 136, p. 808, der 2ten Aufl.). But, allowing that among these passages those referring to Palestine may justly be adduced in proof that the writings of Luke cannot have been intended for Palestine, yet not one of the number goes to prove that the Acts was written in Rome or for Romans. For the section of the Acts referring to Rome afforded no opportunity for notices of the nature of the passages, xvii. 21 and xxiii. 8; and the passages, xvi. 12, xxvii. 8, 12, 16, are derived from one of the sources of the Acts. Add to this that the narrative, xxviii. 11 sqq., is, as regards geography, in much the same predicament as, for instance, xvi. 11; xx. 13 sqq.; xxi. 1 sqq.

(b) That the fact of Theophilus living in Rome is testified by the Canon of Muratori (*Ewald*, p. 40). But this assumption rests on a completely erroneous interpretation of the Canon of Muratori, § 4 (of the text in *Credner*, *Gesch. des neut. Kan.* p. 155).

(c) That the author gives weight to the Roman citizenship of Paul, and to the political purification of the Christian community (Schneckenburger, pp. 242 sqq.; Zeller, pp. 367 sq., 374 sq.; *Lekebusch*, p. 432). But the whole of this political side of the Acts

<sup>1</sup> In *Schweigler* (*Nachapost. Zeitalt.* ii. 38 sqq.) the hypothesis depends on general assumptions of a very problematic nature respecting the history of the most ancient Roman Church.

(*vide supra*, pp. 23 sq.) does not admit of being adduced in favour of the origination of the Acts in Rome, at least on the assumption of the post-apostolic origin of the book and of its political apology for Paul having been intended for Gentiles and not for Jewish Christians (as is assumed, indeed, in common with *Schneckenburger*, by *Zeller* also, p. 368, although he too finds there the indication of a critical state of relations already existing between Christianity and the Roman State authorities, p. 367). On the contrary, precisely this side of the Acts by which, as already intimated, it comes into very close contact with the first Christian Apologists, would probably point to another region (*vide infra*).

(d) That the Pauline-apologetic aim of the Acts is best explained by its design, which destined it for Roman Judaists (*Schneckenburger*, p. 247; *Zeller*, p. 488). This argument is answered by the different design of the Acts defended above, pp. 18 sqq.

(e) That the labours of Paul in Rome form the culminating point of the narrative of the Acts, and that especially the drift of its concluding chapter leads to Rome as the place of writing (or destination) of the book (*Schneckenburger*, pp. 242 sqq.; *Zeller*, pp. 369 sqq.; *Lekebusch*, pp. 430 sq.). But granting that the culmination of the narrative of the Acts in Rome (cf. xix. 21; xxiii. 11; xxvii 1 sqq.) is based not on the simple reproduction of the facts, but on a particular purpose at the same time, yet this culmination in general cannot prove the origination of the Acts in Rome, since the general aim of the Acts, which is to present the development of the Gentile apostleship of Paul, quite naturally made the arrival of the Apostle in the Gentile capital of the world the crowning point of the narrative. In order to view the matter differently, it would have to be proved that the Acts further betrayed a special interest in the Roman Church. And this is precisely what is maintained by *Zeller* and *Lekebusch*, though in opposite ways—*Zeller* attributing to the Acts the intention to represent Paul as the founder of the Roman

Church (p. 373), while Lekebusch, on the other hand, finds in the drift of the narrative, xxviii. 17 sqq., the condition of affairs in the Roman Church "assumed as known" (p. 431). Both views are contradicted by the fact that the narrative in xxviii. 15—31 of the Acts does not in any sense stand in any other relation to Rome than to the other principal scenes of the labours of Paul as the Apostle of the Gentiles. Nothing is here assumed, in so far as it is completely clear what it is that interests the author; but at the same time not a single word of the narrative referred to rests on any special interest of the author of the Acts in the Roman Church, since xxviii. 15 has its parallel in xxi. 17, just as xxviii. 23—28 has in xiii. 42 sqq and in xviii. 6 sq, while everything else (xxviii. 16—22, 30, 31) depends on the narrative the Acts gives of the trial of Paul.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, this being the case with the narrative, xxviii. 15 sqq., we must rather conclude thence that the Acts cannot be intended for Rome. Otherwise the entire withdrawal of special interest in the Roman Church in xxviii. 15, and the manner in which Paul's meeting with this Church is treated,—a manner so cursory and completely confined to other tendencies of the Acts,—would hardly be capable of explanation (cf. *Kostlin*, Synopt Evv. p 294). Thus the authorship of the Acts in Rome must be taken to be not simply incapable of proof, but also entirely improbable. The indications against the conjecture that the Acts was written in Achaia or Macedonia are weaker (*Hilgenfeld*, die Evangg. p. 224). At most only the elucidatory notice, xvii. 21, and the unacquaintance with Athens betrayed perhaps by the author in xvii. 23, might be adduced in favour of the opinion that the Acts will probably have originated at some considerable distance from Attica. Still weaker, however, is the argument that can be brought in favour of this hypothesis, even Hilgenfeld being able to adduce,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the observations generally on xxviii. 15 sqq., where also the intention of the Acts to represent Paul as the founder of the Roman Church is in particular disputed. Even Zeller, however, is disposed from the Acts stopping short before the death of Paul to infer its authorship in Rome. The matter is, however, explained sufficiently on other grounds.

besides arguments which are equally or more in favour of Asia Minor, nothing more than the tradition of Jerome. By far the most probable hypothesis respecting the home of the writings of Luke is that of Kostlin (*loc. cit.* pp. 294 sqq.), who thinks they were written in Asia Minor, probably in Ephesus. If we deduct from Kostlin's argument the points which may be considered to have been refuted by Zeller's criticism (pp. 482 sqq.), yet there are other parts to which we ought to continue to adhere, and what may be adduced in favour of his hypothesis generally may be stated as follows :

(a) That Marcion first became acquainted with the writings of Luke in his Roman period is indeed possible, but it is not the most probable case, considering the significance of his canon for his system ; and at any rate his employment of Luke's Gospel, and, moreover, the use of Luke's Gospel in the fourth Gospel, may be considered as traces of the original diffusion of Luke's writings in Asia Minor, the more so as it cannot be shown of Justin that he first became acquainted with Luke's writings in Rome

(b) A special interest in Asia Minor is betrayed in the Acts, inasmuch as apostolic persons of importance in the traditions of Asia Minor are brought before us in the narrative of the Acts,—as, for instance, John along with Peter (iii. 1—viii. 22); the evangelist Philip (vi. 5; viii. 5 sqq.; xxi. 8 sq); Joseph Barabbas (i. 23) (cf. *Hilgenfeld, Zeitschr.* 1858, p. 596); further, inasmuch as the Acts shows itself well informed respecting the political state of affairs here (and in Greece); and especially as the scene of the greatest part of the narrative, precisely where the interest is principally of a geographical nature (xiii. 1—xxi. 16, the sketch of Paul's journeys) is laid in the region of Asia Minor. But no locality is more prominent as the home of a Christian community in the Pauline half of the Acts than Ephesus. The section devoted to this place, xviii. 24—xix. 41, is an interpolation interrupting the strict plan of the Acts, which for its explanation does not by any means imperatively demand

any special regard to be paid to Ephesus, but nevertheless makes such regard as a subordinate consideration very probable, and may well rest in part on a tradition which had fallen under the author's particular notice.<sup>1</sup> Similarly also the position and general character of the speech, xx. 18 sqq., are at all events entirely independent of all special relations of the author to Ephesus. But still it seems characteristic that it is addressed to Ephesian Presbyters (xx. 16 sq.), and in this sense also xx. 29 may possibly not be desitute of local reference.<sup>2</sup>

(c) A book with the tendency or bias described above, pp. 24 sq., cannot be thought to have originated anywhere more probably than in Asia Minor, the most ancient home of Pauline Christianity, the soil on which the struggle between Paulinism and the Christianity which adhered to the primitive Apostles commenced, and in all probability was carried on and decided.<sup>3</sup>

(d) The political character of the Acts also leads to Asia Minor, where, under Trajan, Christianity first independently confronted the Gentile state, and where (in conjunction, as it appears, with Greece) the oldest apologetic literature also principally had its seat (*Quadratus* and *Aristides* [*Eus. Ecc. Hist.* iv. 3], the former, indeed, according to *Euseb.* iv. 23, 3, Bishop of Athens, but perhaps by his "prophecy" [*Eus.* iii. 37, 1; v. 17, 2 sq.] originally allotted to Asia Minor; the latter, first made an "Athenian philosopher" by *Jerome*, *Catal.* c. 20; further, *Melito* of Sardis and *Appolinaris* of Hierapolis). Credner, Einl. § 108;

<sup>1</sup> The passage, xix. 33, is also here especially worth notice. If we may explain it on the assumption of further knowledge possessed by the reader, then at any rate it is unique of its kind in the Acts, and in this sense might serve to confirm in no inconsiderable degree the special reference of the Acts to Ephesus.

<sup>2</sup> Zeller (p. 486) likewise does not deny all weight to these arguments when, in rejecting them, he admits that the author of the Acts, although he wrote his work, as Zeller contends, in Rome, yet by birth and education may have belonged to the East.

<sup>3</sup> On the contrary, in the Roman Church, according to its supposed origin, Jewish elements from the first were of special importance, and it is precisely here that the existence of so deep an interest in Paul as late as the beginning of the second century, as is presupposed by the Acts, is particularly improbable.

Meyer; Reuss, § 207, leave undecided the entire question as to the place where the Acts was written.

The traditional assumption which was originally and is still at the present time for the most part connected with the name of Luke was, that the author of the Acts was a Gentile Christian; and this assumption, on the supposition of the post-apostolic origin of the Acts in accordance with what was laid down above, pp. 18 sqq., on the standpoint and character of the book, can but be adhered to.<sup>1</sup> Only recently a few very isolated attempts have been made to prove the Jewish birth of the author. In Wittichen this assumption, however, depends on an entirely different view of the tendency of Luke's writings, and is answered, so far as it refers to the Acts, by the Commentary. Tiele's most superficial argument is quite idle. The difference with Col. iv. 10 sqq. he makes up at all events in a very arbitrary manner. The Hebraizing language of Luke's writings is said to betray the born Jew; but in order to be able to build anything on this argument, we should at any rate have to distinguish what belongs to the sources and what to the author of Luke's writings,<sup>2</sup> even if, in the oldest Christian literature in general, anything could be proved thereby. Further it is alleged that Luke in his work, which was intended for Greek readers, gives Hebrew measures, Luke xiii. 21; xvi. 6; Acts xix. 19,—but in the passage last quoted this is not at all the case, while the two others are

<sup>1</sup> For the nationality of the author, the use of *oi Ιουδαιοις*, discussed in the Com. on xii. 3; xxii. 12 (cf. also Luke vii. 3; xxiii. 51), is also very characteristic. On the other hand, from the author's supposed unacquaintance with Athens (xvii. 23), and the acquaintance which in xxi. 33 he seems to manifest with Jerusalem, we can gather all the less as to his affairs, as in the case of Jerusalem, according to the view laid down above as to the time of the Acts, his knowledge can in any case have only been indirect.

<sup>2</sup> How easily *Tiele* makes his proof, is shown by his refusal to enter more particularly upon the boldest, and at all events the most decisive, position in his argument, namely, that the sentences of Luke "were thought in Hebrew before they were expressed in Greek," because this "would lead too far." Hence *Tiele* is content simply to refer to *kai αιρόται*, Luke xix. 2, which is said to be the Hebrew נִשְׁתַּת. It would have been more convincing had the attempt been made to re-translate into Hebrew the passage, Luke i. 1—4.

derived from the sources employed by the author. Finally, it is said that it was only possible for a born Jew to have employed the simple ἀναβαίνειν for "going to Jerusalem," Acts xviii. 22, and to have given the statement from the Calendar in xxvii. 9,—assertions which are quite arbitrary, and which, moreover, are invalidated by the correct text, xviii. 21, 22, and by the circumstance that xxvii. 9 (just as xx. 6) is copied from an extrinsic source.

#### 4—EXEGETICAL AIDS

*Chrysostom* Homil. in Act. App.; T. IV. ed *Savil*; T. IX. *Montfauc*—*Theophylact*. Explicatt. in Act App. c. interpret. *Laur. Sifani*.; Col. 1568, fol. Further, in two other forms (*Theoph.* 2, 3, b. *Griesb*) in the ed. v. *Finetti*—*Oecumenii*, Comm in Act. App. etc. interp. *Heuten* ed *Morell*; Paris, 1630—*Scholia* in Act. App. ex codd AFD et H in *Matthai's* ed—*Catena* in Act. ss. App. Descrips. &c. *J. A. Cramer*; Oxon, 1838.—*Beda* Venerab. expositio super Act. App. Opp. T. V.; *Basil*—*Casp. Sanctii*, Comment. in Act. App., Col 1817.—*Estii*, Annott. in Acta App. in Annott. in praec. ac diffic. S Scr. loca; Mog 1667, fol.—*Phil. a Limborch*, Comment in Act. App.; Roter. 1711; Bas. 1740, fol.—*S F. N. Mori*, Vers et explicat. Act App. ed. *Dindorf*; Lips. 1794, 2 vols—*J. O. Thiess*, Ap.-Gesch ubers.; 1800.—*Kuinoel*, Comm. in libr. N Test. hist.; ed. 2, 1827.—N. T. ed. *Kopp*; Vol. III. auct. *Heinrichs*.—*Olshausen*, Comment. II. Th. 4. Abth. v *Ebrard*; Konigsh 1862.—*Meyer*, Comment. ub. d. N. T. III. Abth. 4. ed.; Gott. 1870.—*Schrader*, d. Ap. Paulus, Thl. 5.—*Bruno Bauer*, die AG.; Berl. 1850.—*M. Baumgarten*, die AG.; Braunschw 1859.—*J. P. Lange*, Bibelw. Th. 5, v. *Lechler*, u. *Gerok*; Elberf. 1869—*B. Hackett*, Commentary on the Acts; Boston, 1863.—*Bunsen's* Bibelw. Th. IV.; Leipz. 1864.—*Bisping*, Erklar. der AG.; Munst. 1866.—*J. E. Im. Walch*, In Acta App.; 3 vols. Jen. 1756-61.—*Neander*, Gesch. d. Pflanzung u. Leitung d. christl. Kirche durch

die Apostel.; 2 Bde. Gotha, 1847.—*Baur*, Paulus der Ap.; Leipz. 1866.—*Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeitalt.; Tubing. 1846.—*Lechler*, Das Apost. u. das nachapost. Zeitalt.; Stuttg. 1857.—*H. W. J. Thiersch*, Die Kirche im ap. Zeitalt.; Franf. 1858.—*J. P. Lange*, Das Apost. Zeitalt.; Braunschw. 1853-54.—*Ewald*, Gesch. des Volks Isr. Bd. VI.; Gott. 1868.—*Renan*, Les Apôtres.; Par. 1866. St. Paul; Par. 1869.—Besides these, the writings quoted above of *Schneckenburger*, *Zeller* and *Lekebusch*.



THE  
ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

BY DR EDUARD ZELLER.



## P R E F A C E.

---

THIS treatise originated in articles on the same subject which appeared in the Tubingen Theological Journal between 1848—1851. The great attention bestowed on these articles from various quarters and in divers senses, allows me to hope that it would be desired, as well by the opponents as the partizans of the opinions which they represent, that I should give them publicity in a new edition and as an independent whole. I accordingly subjected my earlier labours to a repeated revision, in order to fill up interstices, to rectify errors in statement, inaccuracies in expression and defects of arrangement, and to remove what appeared suitable only to a periodical; so that in fact no section of this treatise has remained without various alterations and additions. A quarter or a fifth may be regarded as new, or at least as entirely metamorphosed. The substantial results of my earlier researches have again been confirmed to my conviction, but I trust that I have succeeded in defining them with more precision, and in establishing them more completely.

The literature of the subject has received such an important increase since the first appearance of this inquiry, that it almost seems as if compensation were to be made all at once for the protracted and unjust neglect of the Acts, which only a few years ago admitted the application to our own times of the well-known verdict of Chrysostom. I have endeavoured to make use of these resources as far as they were at my command, and also to search more ancient writings from which any advantage might be expected. I have also sought instruction from the adversaries of my opinions, and I gladly acknowledge that their very contradictions have called my attention to various points which I had previously overlooked. I must likewise praise the majority for having adhered in their polemics to the tone which

ought never to be abandoned in scientific discussion. That an Ebrard should have striven to conceal the baldness of his baseless labours by trickiness and distortion, by rude calumnies and shallow scurrilities, or that Lange should inflate the greatness of his vocabulary in proportion to the meagreness and perplexity of his scientific ideas—to this we are so accustomed that it affords little room for remark. Among the researches springing from a critical standpoint, besides Baur's works, I must especially name those of Hilgenfeld, Volkmar and Köstlin. To my regret, I was unable to make use of Hilgenfeld's treatise on the Apostolic Fathers in the first division of the present work; it was therefore the more gratifying to find subsequently that his view of the origin of these works, and their relation to the two books of Luke, harmonized with mine on all essential points. In other respects, the course and tendency of the present investigation are generally known to those interested in the examination of the most ancient Christianity.

I do not know how many such are still to be found in Germany. The exertions of our ecclesiastics, assisted by political reaction, have been so effectual, that the majority of our theologians not only look with suspicion or indifference on this or that scientific opinion, but regard scientific knowledge in general with the same feelings; and those who twenty or thirty years ago gave the signal of war against "unbelieving" science, are now beginning to reap in sorrow the natural fruits of their deeds. Ecclesiasticism, and only ecclesiasticism, has been so long preached—it has so often been repeated that Theology is an affair of the heart and not of the reason—that even in historical researches regarding primitive Christianity and its records, scholarship and criticism were far less concerned than harmony with the consciousness of the Christian community, and avoidance of all that might impugn the prevalent impressions of sacred books and persons, or place a stumbling-block in the way of pious belief; this and the like has been so often and so unctuously reiterated, that people have ended by believing it; and how much easier is it after all to say Yes to a traditional opinion, than to search for personal conviction with pain and labour, in self-sacrificing toil, amidst doubt and conflict; and how little can we wonder that, for the most part, our rising Theologians have found it incomparably more convenient to attain in this

simple way what appears a perfectly serviceable Theology, with office and bread at the same time, instead of entering on the slow and tedious path of inward struggles and outward aversion ! But it ought not to cause surprise if the progress of ecclesiastical reaction should extend further than had been originally designed, and that strength was wanting to halt at a given point in the downward course. At first, Christian consciousness, the belief of the Church in general, were proclaimed the shrine and rule of theological inquiry. But what constitutes Christianity is an historical question, which cannot be satisfactorily answered except by means of the very researches which this claim endeavoured to prohibit. For as the essence of a phenomenon can only be known by the sum of its operations, the distinction between Christian and non-Christian, if a systematic procedure be desired, must be derived not from one special circle of the Christian world, or from one particular epoch of its history, not even from its earliest moments, but its entire course must be taken into consideration, that, by an exhaustive examination of its past career, combined with a careful discrimination between permanent and temporary elements, we may ascertain the real essence and the historical aim of Christianity. It was naturally impossible to resolve on doing this; so the next expedient was to substitute for the Christian consciousness the doctrines of primitive Christianity, of the Bible, or at least of the New Testament. But even thus no unalterable rule had been found. What constituted the true doctrine of the Scriptures had not only been disputed from ancient times among Christian creeds, but this very problem had been solved in such a manner by the "unbelieving" science of our day, that the principle of scriptural authority threatened to become utterly useless ; for if not only the standpoint of the Old Testament is incapable of direct union with Christianity, but if, as was maintained during the last century, the New Testament itself contains a number of different and partially incompatible conceptions of doctrine, where is the point which can afford an unassailable refuge for our theological convictions ? To refute this assertion and the results of criticism dependent on it, in a scientific manner, was a task whose difficulty soon became obvious ; the very object of again resorting to Scriptural authority was to gain something positive, something above and beyond the strife of scientific opinions. Nothing now

remained but to resign a further portion of the scientific freedom which, in conjunction with faith, had hitherto been a subject of pride, and, withdrawing from the polemical study of Scripture, to fall back on the formularies of the Church. The emulation, the hierarchical arrogance with which this has been accomplished by some who still consider themselves exalted above the common herd of orthodoxy by their scientific culture and their liberality, has been witnessed only too frequently in the history of our synods and theological conferences during the last few years. If, in token of spiritual freedom, the evangelical union was still maintained, it was quite another thing to adhere to the "fundamental principles of the Evangelical Church," together with its postulates and deductions, and with "moral pathos and measures" of Church discipline to require from others also a subscription to a special formula, such as the Concordienformel, or the *Formula consensus*. It was only a pity that those same postulates and deductions had been acknowledged by the ancient theologians also, and enunciated in those very formulas whose sphere of thought it seemed impossible to adopt, and whose exclusiveness could not be combined with the present stage of civilization. And still worse,—even the fundamental principles of the evangelical confessions of past days, when more closely inspected, proved to be less unanimous than had been imagined. For if even their incongruities were permeated by a community of character, they differed from the first in the dogmatic apprehension of what they held in common. It was exactly these dogmatic apprehensions that were proclaimed the standard by which each man announced his adherence to the formularies of the Evangelical Church. Hence it was inevitable that the conflict should break out anew; and to the semi-faithfulness to the formularies of the Church Unionist party, the entire allegiance of the New Lutheran zealots might oppose itself with more prospect of success, as the logical inferences from the common premisses were undeniably on the side of the latter. That *this* ancient faith should be intolerant, that it cannot endure any free science or even any other form of Protestant piety by its side, is inherent in its being; and when it strives not only to scatter but to conquer the United Church, and to expel the reformed Confession from its own lawful possessions, it does only what it cannot avoid, and nothing more. Thus we have now come to such a pass, that the contest rages

about the “Variata” and the “Invariata,” the Lutheran and the Heidelberg catechism, with a vehemence worthy of the spring-tide of orthodox fanaticism ; that consistories decide on who may be allowed to teach philosophy at our universities ; that candidates scarcely past their examination demand the removal of their examiners, because they are not sufficiently orthodox ; that every one considers himself justified in discussing matters of theology all the louder, and to have all the greater claims to preferment in the Church, the more ignorant he is of all that was formerly regarded as the indispensable foundation of all theological education, and the more exclusively he has restricted himself, with dull indolence of mind, to learning by rote prescribed formulas, and repeating watchwords without comprehending them ; and amidst this perverted party impulse the theological recruits seem likely to become the victims of such barbarity, that it is almost a question whether it is worth while to spend time and trouble in scientific labours which meet with such scant acceptance from the greater number of those for whom they were specially designed. From the principle of illiberality has come forth an abundant crop of contention, vehemence and perversity. Theology has been arrested because the majority of its representatives are not sufficiently vigorous to endure the keen fresh air of unprejudiced knowledge, and the masses fancy that it suits them better to echo others than to think for themselves, to float with the tide of reaction than to breast its waves. This may be deplored, but it cannot be a subject of surprise. Whether time will bring a change, or whether German Protestantism will stagnate in the Byzantine conditions towards which it is now hastening with all sail on ; whether the voice of those who wish to place the Evangelical Church on freer ground will die away unheard or work effectually, we know not. But this we do know, that an improvement in our condition may be the more certainly expected, the more completely each performs his duty in his own station ; and willingly as we admit that incomparably more depends on the moulding of the great historical relations than on scientific efforts and services, we are nevertheless of opinion science must not weary in its vocation of assisting, according to its power, in the comprehension of the great questions of the present and the past. In this spirit may the present contribution be kindly received, however much or little be expected from it.

## INTRODUCTION.

---

ALL critical investigations concerning a book refer either to its origin or to its subject-matter. The first of these questions not only relates to the person of the author, the place, the period and the outward occasion of his work, but it also includes everything which throws light on the internal history of its origin, the motive, the plan, the system of the writer, and the sources and means of assistance at his disposal. Criticism of the subject-matter will always vary with the character of the book: in works of history; it becomes historical; in artistic writings, æsthetic; in dogmatic treatises, dogmatical; and, according to the object which the critic has in view, the same book will be contemplated now in one aspect, now in another. But this criticism of facts is always distinguished from purely literary criticism, as it is not concerned in explaining the origin, but in pronouncing sentence on the nature, of the work, and the value and correctness of its assertions. In other respects, however, the two are nearly allied, and each depends more or less upon the other. Even with poems and didactic works, the understanding and just estimation of the subject-matter depend in many ways on a knowledge of the historical conditions among which they originated, as well as the object and design pursued by their authors. This of course applies in a far higher degree to historical writings; for as the value of evidence must be judged primarily by the trustworthiness of the witness, a verdict on the truth of an historical statement must naturally be preceded by an estimate of all the points which can throw light on

the designs and resources of the author, his character, and his capability of imparting the truth. Certainly, however, owing to the incompleteness and untrustworthiness of our other information, these conditions can often only be discovered by deductions drawn from the nature of the writings; and even when we are more fully instructed as to the person and relations of the authors, it is still only by means of the writings themselves that we become thoroughly acquainted with their internal motives and the actual plan and object of their works. But this understanding of the writings, especially of historical ones, will always be defective without criticism of the contents. Thus we are involved in a vicious circle: criticism of the matter is assumed by literary criticism, and literary criticism by criticism of the matter, and there is no direct outlet by which we can entirely escape from this circle. Yet that does not render it impossible for criticism of each kind to accomplish its task with approximate certainty and completeness. On one side, extraneous declarations of the author, or reliable evidence from others, may so fully corroborate the sentence of literary criticism, that it may be extensively pursued without entering more minutely upon the criticism of the matter; and, on the other side, not only the truth of dogmatic assertions independent of the person who makes them, but the correctness of historical statements, can be decided without further knowledge of the witness, when they are either refuted by internal contradictions, or by their incompatibility with established facts; or else when they are substantiated by accordance with what has been confirmed on their grounds. Thus either method is generally practicable: literary research may precede the verification of facts, or the latter may precede the former. In both cases, gaps will remain at first, only to be filled up later; but these gaps may possibly be so trivial as not to disturb the decision of the main questions. Which system may be most effectual in any given case will depend on its special condition. If we can procure information concerning the author of a writing, his object and his relations,

without undertaking a verification of the statements it contains, it is best to put the literary criticism of its origin before the criticism of the contents. If, on the contrary, we have to look to internal evidence for all our knowledge of its origin, and cannot obtain it without criticising the contents, criticism of the subject-matter must naturally precede literary investigation. Lastly, if the two questions are so entangled, that, although we have some extraneous information respecting the origin of a writing, yet a complete knowledge is not to be gained without criticism of the subject-matter, we must in this case first carry the literary investigation as far as possible by itself, after which criticism of the contents comes into play; and only when the latter has completed its work does a final decision as to the origin of the writing become possible, or perhaps the necessity of repeated alternations of both methods becomes apparent. In this plight we now find ourselves with regard to the Acts of the Apostles. We can trace the existence of the book up to a certain date by the aid of tradition, but beyond that limit external evidence leaves us in the lurch, and inferences drawn from the internal constitution of the work only yield a result when founded on a firm conviction of the accuracy and credibility of the narrative. The course to be pursued in our inquiries is therefore determined by the nature of the subject. We shall first examine the most ancient witnesses for our document; we shall next submit the historical character of its statements to a searching investigation; and, after these preliminaries, we shall finally endeavour to bring the question of its origin to a decision.

## *First Part.*

### **EXTERNAL EVIDENCES OF THE EXISTENCE AND ORIGIN OF THE WRITINGS OF LUKE.**

IF our present inquiry concerned only the Acts of the Apostles, the task would be tolerably simple. It becomes more complicated and arduous from the fact that our book designates itself as the work of the third evangelist. This circumstance obliges us to follow up, not the traces of the Acts only, but also the more numerous and complicated indications of the third gospel in the most ancient Christian literature, and to grasp the problem in the comprehensive manner denoted by our title. This would be requisite even should the designation subsequently prove incorrect; far less can it be omitted if there be a prospect of substantiating it. Under these circumstances, it is fortunate that the most difficult of the questions here involved has recently been answered with tolerable certainty. While we therefore enter more fully into detail only where there are still subjects in dispute requiring solution, on other points we shall limit ourselves to an epitome of the substantial results.

#### **1. THE MOST ANCIENT EVIDENCES, PRIOR TO MARCION AND JUSTIN.**

That neither of the two books of which Luke is supposed to be the author is quoted in the New Testament is beyond doubt; for the dreams of ancient and also of more modern writers re-

specting the *εὐαγγέλιον μου* of Paul (Rom. ii. 6) as the Gospel of Luke, have long required no refutation. The more important is the internal relation of the writings of Luke to the other books of the New Testament, and especially of the third to the other Gospels, which, according to all probability, have in part made use of it, and in part been used by it; and this will always remain a decisive point in viewing the historical development of primitive Christianity and its literature. But as matters now stand, an inquiry concerning the origin of the writings of Luke is more likely to throw light on this relation than to be enlightened by it. For, as is well known, opinions are at present so divided as to the age and origin of the New Testament Scriptures, and especially on questions about the Gospels, that in this department there seems no possibility of finding any recognized starting-point. Yet the problem itself is much too comprehensive and intricate to be solved parenthetically in a treatise like this. Even had more positive results been arrived at, we should still have got only a relative decision: it might be known that the Gospel of Luke was later than that of Matthew and more ancient than those of Mark and John, but as the age of these can also be only comparatively and approximatively determined, considerable margin would still remain, so that other grounds must still be sought for a more accurate decision. Hence, so far as we are obliged to touch on the connection of Luke with the other books of the New Testament, it will be only in the last chapters of this work, and even then only with the precaution required by the nature of the subject. For the present, we must leave it undiscussed.

The writings of the New Testament are supposed to be followed immediately in the order of time by the works of the so-called Fathers. This is, however, only partially true; for in all probability not one of these works belongs to its pretended author, and several of them are certainly more recent than Marcion and Justin. Only the first Epistle of Clement of Rome, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Shepherd of Hermas, seem to date

from the first decades of the second century, before the appearance of Gnosticism in the West;<sup>1</sup> and about the same period it is probable that Papias composed the writing of which some fragments have been preserved by Irenæus and Eusebius. But it cannot be proved, nor is it even likely, that in any of these writings either the Gospel of St. Luke or the Acts have been used. In Barnabas we find, in ch. xix., among a mass of miscellaneous exhortations, the words *παντὶ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδον*. This is certainly the same precept which Matthew, v. 42, expresses, *τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδον*; and Luke in vi. 30, *παντὶ δὲ τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδον*. But that Barnabas derived it from Luke in particular cannot be proved by the *παντὶ*, which is common to both. For whether this word be added or omitted does not affect the sense; it is merely a simple and obvious amplification of the briefer *τῷ αἰτοῦντί*. Three cases are equally credible: that it stood originally in the primitive Gospel, but was omitted by Matthew; that Luke and Barnabas severally and independently inserted it; or that one of the two borrowed it from the other. It can only be proved by much more decided evidence that the author of the Epistle of Barnabas was acquainted with our third Gospel.

Just as little is implied in several statements in the first Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians appearing to echo passages in the third Gospel and the Acts. Thus we read in the thirteenth chapter of that treatise, as a saying of Christ, *ἐλεεῖτε ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε ἀφίετε ἵνα ἀφεθῇ ὑμῖν· ὡς ποιεῖτε, οὕτω ποιηθήσεται ὑμῖν· ὡς δίδοτε οὕτως δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· ὡς κρίνετε, οὕτως κριθήσεται ὑμῖν· ὡς χρηστεύεσθε, οὕτως χρηστευθήσεται ὑμῖν·* φ *μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, ἐν αὐτῷ μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.* But these words have only a general similarity of idea to Luke vi. 36—38, while in detail and form of expression they diverge so widely from all parallel passages in our Gospels,

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Schwegler, *Nachapostol. Zeitalter*. We cannot here enter on the discussion of contrary views, such as those of *Ritschl*, who considers the first Epistle of Clement to be genuine, and, on the other hand, transfers the Shepherd of Hermas to the middle of the second century (*Entstehung d. Altkathol. Kirche*, pp. 282, &c. 297, &c.).

that the one passage suffices to prove that the author of the Epistle made use of an uncanonical Gospel.<sup>1</sup> The same source is also suggested to us by the words in chapter xlvi.: εἴπε γάρ (αε. δ. Χριστός)· οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγενήθη, ἦν ἔνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι· κρείττον ἦν αὐτῷ περιτεθῆναι μύλον, καὶ καταποντισθῆναι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἦν ἔνα τῶν μικρῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι; for we cannot, like Cotelier, to whom Hefele offers no contradiction,<sup>2</sup> look on it as an amalgamation of the passages, Matt. xxvi. 24; xviii. 6; Luke xvii. 2; Mark ix. 42. In chapter xxiv., ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπεῖρων καὶ ἐβαλεν εἰς τὴν γῆν, &c., can scarcely suggest for comparison Matt. xiii. 3 or Luke viii. 5, for here we have no parable; and also ἐξῆλθεν is not to be taken in a narrative sense, but as a *præteritum consuetudinis*. The citation of Ps. lxxxviii. 21, at the beginning of ch. xviii., is certainly not derived from the divergent quotation in Acts xiii. 22; no more can ch. v. (Παῦλος . . ἐπτάκις δεσμὰ φορέσας, φιγαδευθεὶς, λιθασθεὶς) refer to Acts xiii., for nothing is here said of the Apostle's seven-fold imprisonment; and it is more probably either derived from tradition, or inferred from 2 Cor xi. 24; the later imprisonments in Jerusalem and Rome being added to the five there mentioned. Finally, it is possible that ch. ii., in the words ἥδιον διδόντες ἦ λαμβάνοντες, alludes to the utterance of Jesus quoted in Acts xx. 35, but the author probably owes this saying not to the Acts, but to his apocryphal Gospel; and if it is also to be found in the Acts, the most that can be concluded is, that the author of this work likewise made use of the same or a kindred Gospel. Whether the *second* Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians refers to our third Gospel is of no importance, by reason of its late origin (180—200). Ch. ii, οὐκ ἡλθον καλέσαι δικαιοὺς ἀλλὰ ἄμαρτωλοὺς, is referred to Matt. ix. 13, Luke v. 32: chapter vi., οὐδεὶς οἰκέτης

<sup>1</sup> This divergence from all our texts has been far too lightly regarded by Ritschl (Tübingen Theol. Journal, x. 495) when, without more ado, he quotes this passage as a sample of verbal harmony between Matthew and Luke, not even alluding to the possible existence of an uncanonical Gospel.

<sup>2</sup> And Ritschl, in the same Journal at the same place.

δύναται δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεύειν, to Matt. vi. 24; Luke xvi. 13; and at least in the last instance, the supposed Clement agrees with Luke, in opposition to Matthew; while in the first he diverges from Luke and coincides with Matthew. But as the same author undeniably quotes sayings in ch. v. 8 from an apocryphal Gospel, it may be presumed that he also derived those in which he harmonizes with our synoptical Evangelists from the same authority—The Shepherd of Hermas contains no apparent reference to the writings of Luke. In Lib. ii. Mand. v., ὅταν ἀποστῆ (τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα) ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, οὐκ κατοικεῖ, γίνεται ὁ ἀνθρωπός . . πεπληρωμένος τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν πονηρῶν, Hefele calls to mind Luke xi. 26; in Lib i Vis iii. ch. 9 (vobis, qui prætestis ecclesiæ et amatis primos consessus), Luke xi. 43; xx. 46, besides other passages; in Lib ii. Mand xii. ch 6 (μᾶλλον φοβήθητι τὸν κύριον τὸν δυνάμενον σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι), Luke xii. 5; in Lib. i. Vis i. c 3 (tanquam avrarius producens opus suum exponit ei, cui vult, sic et tu verbum quotidianum justum docens abscondes grande peccatum), Luke xix. 13; in Lib. iii. Sim. iv. c. 2 (a parable of a vineyard), Luke xx.; in Lib. i. Vis. iv. 2 (credens, quod per nullum alium poteris salvus esse, nisi per magnum et honorificum nomen ejus), Acts iv. 12; not to mention other parallels still more remote. But the simplest comparison of these passages will show that we have no reason to assume that Hermas really made use of the works of Luke.—Finally, as regards Papias, Credner<sup>1</sup> considers his acquaintance with the Gospel of Luke to be manifest from the similarity of his opening words to those of Luke's prologue,<sup>2</sup> the πρεσβύτεροι of the one being synonymous with αὐτόπται of the other; and when Papias makes inquiries, εἰ παρηκολουθηκάς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτεροῖς ἔλθοι, this unmis-

<sup>1</sup> Introduction to the New Testament, i. 202.

<sup>2</sup> Ap. Eus. iii. 39, 2: Οὐκ ὀκνήσω δὲ σοι καὶ ὅσα ποτὲ παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἐμαθούν καὶ καλῶς ἴμνημόνευσα συνκατατάξαι . . Οὐ γάρ τοις τὰ πολλὰ λέγοντιν ἔχαιρουν, ὥσπερ οἱ πολλοί, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τάληθῇ διδάσκουσιν· οὐδὲ τοῖς τάς ἀλλοτρίας ἐντολάς μνημονεύουσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τάς παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου τῇ πίστει δεδομένας καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῆς παραγενομένας τῆς ἀληθείας. εἰ δὲ που καὶ παρακολουθηκάς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις Ἐλθοι, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους, &c.

takably refers to Luke i. 3, *παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς*. But Luke by no means intends hereby to describe himself as a *παρηκολουθηκώς τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις*, but merely says that he has carefully followed the whole course of the Gospel history; and so, on closer inspection, nothing remains of the supposed reference but the word *παρακολουθεῖν*, which cannot certainly prove any allusion in one passage to the other. That Papias as well as Luke should appeal to the tradition of the original eye-witnesses, is too natural to afford any clue to their mutual relations. On the other hand, suppose that Papias was acquainted with our Luke, it would be very remarkable that he omitted him in his well-known notice of the most ancient Gospels; or that Eusebius in his extract (iii. 39, 14) should have neglected to transmit any information respecting it; for as the work of the personal follower of an Apostle, it stood on the same level with the Gospel of Mark. The only case which would explain an intentional omission on the part of Papias would be if he disapproved of it on account of its Pauline character. But then he would not have used it. We have therefore no right to assert that Papias, or any other of the writers above mentioned, was acquainted with either of Luke's two books. Marcion and Justin are the first who certify the existence of one of the two, i.e. of the Gospel.

## 2 MARCION.

The question whether Marcion had our Luke before him, and compiled from him his own peculiar Gospel, has, it is well known, been eagerly discussed of late years. After the earlier doubts of the truth of this assertion had apparently been refuted since Hahn's work, they were renewed in a more thorough-going and determined manner by Schwegler,<sup>1</sup> Ritschl,<sup>2</sup> and Baur;<sup>3</sup> it was surmised that the variations of Marcion's text

<sup>1</sup> Tübingen Theol. Journal, ii. 575, &c. Post-Apostolic Age, i. 260.

<sup>2</sup> Das Evang. Marcion's u. d. canon. Evang. Lukas. 1846

<sup>3</sup> Tübingen Theol. Journal, v. 457, &c. Critical Inquiries concerning the Canonical Gospels, 395.

from our own were not to be accounted for on the supposition of alteration for dogmatic purposes ; that Marcion's recension frequently contains the oldest readings, and by restoring a better sense and connection, proves its greater originality almost throughout. Hence it was concluded that, far from mutilating and falsifying our Gospel of Luke, Marcion had rather preserved in his own the original text of that Gospel with essential fidelity, while our Luke was derived from an anti-Marcionite, catholicising version of the "primitive Luke." This view, however, has recently been shaken so much by the searching investigations of Volkmar<sup>1</sup> and Hilgenfeld,<sup>2</sup> that it seems to be generally surrendered in the form in which it first appeared ; Ritschl<sup>3</sup> himself has returned to the opinion that our Gospel of Luke in its present form was found by Marcion, and worked over by him. Baur, however, adheres to a considerable part of his former conclusions :<sup>4</sup> if his adversaries<sup>5</sup> are obliged to admit in divers instances that Marcion has preserved the primitive text, he makes this a claim for yet wider concessions. He allows that the greater number of the passages in which the Marcionite Gospel differs from ours, must be regarded as wilful alterations in favour of a certain system ; but as they cannot all be explained from this point of view, and as the very passages which cannot well have been altered by Marcion suit the connection and the primitive tendency of the Gospel of Luke still less, he thinks that Marcion must have possessed an older text, different from our canonical one, which was first put into its present shape by the author of the Acts after his time.

<sup>1</sup> Ueber d. Evang. d. Lukas. u. Tubingen Theol. Jour. ix. 1850. *Gospel by Marcion*, 185.

<sup>2</sup> Kritische Untersuchung ub. d. Evang. d. Justin. d. Clement. Homilien u. Marcion, 1850, p. 391. Marcionische Evang. Tubingen Journal, xii. 192. The work of Harting on the Gospel of Marcion (Utr. 1849) I am not personally acquainted with.

<sup>3</sup> Tubingen Journal, x. 1851, 528.

<sup>4</sup> *Gospel of Mark* (1851), p. 191.

<sup>5</sup> Hilgenfeld, Evang. Justin, p. 469, and to a less extent Volkmar, Evang. d. Markus, 187.

It would not of course be possible, nor after the careful investigations of others would it be necessary, for us here to enter with more detail into all the points relating to Marcion's Gospel. We may assume it as proved and generally acknowledged that Marcion not only made use of an older Gospel, but that he revised, altered and in places abbreviated it, and that this Gospel was in the main no other than our Luke. On the other hand, it is still a question how far this identity existed, whether Marcion possessed it in its present form, or whether after Marcion, and perhaps with reference to the assertions of this Gnostic, it was subjected to a final redaction, and in this case how far the alterations extended which were made by this last hand, and by whom they were effected. All such questions we can now consider only so far as they may be answered by a comparison of the Marcionite text with our own; but inasmuch as this object requires us to discuss the tendency and idiosyncrasy of our Gospel, we must postpone our verdict to a later portion of this work.

Let us now review the passages in which the Marcionite text deviated from ours, omitting those of which it is obviously and avowedly probable that the originality is on the side of our text, and that they were purposely altered by Marcion. It seems to us that in several cases Marcion has certainly preserved the primitive reading. If it be quite unimportant that in Luke x 21 he omits the *πάτερ* before *κύριε*, and inserts the words *εὐχαριστῶ καὶ* before *ἔφομολογοῦμαι*, and if therefore this variation can have no influence on the question, even should Marcion's reading<sup>1</sup> be the correct one, in the following verse we must accept as primitive the conjectural Marcionite text, *οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα, εἰ μὴ ὁ νῖος, καὶ τὸν νῖον, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ καὶ φῶν ὁ νῖος ἀποκαλύψῃ*, for the same form is presupposed by Justin, Apol i. 63, and substantially also in Tryph. c. 100; and moreover with trifling variation in the Clementine Homilies (xvii. and xviii. 4, 13, 20); and likewise the Markosian (p. 13), according to Iren. i. 20, 3; and as regards the aorist *ἔγνω*, by Clement and Origen in nearly all their quota-

<sup>1</sup> As Volkmar endeavours to prove, Evang. Markus, p. 187.

tions. So late as the year 270 it is found in the writing of the orthodox bishops to Paul of Samosata, and in the fourth century several times in Epiphanius.<sup>1</sup> Even Tertullian, *adv. Marc.* ii. 27, has *cognovit*; and the Clementines when disputing the Gnostic interpretation of ἔγνω (xviii. 13) are unable to offer any objection to the reading, little as they are wont, especially in this passage, to overlook divergences of the Marcionite text from their own.<sup>2</sup> Seeing that in this case the opponents of Gnosticism agree with its adherents in accepting the Marcionite reading, it seems that our present one cannot have originated till nearly the end of the second century, not long before Irenæus, in whose works we first meet it. How the case stands in this respect as to the second variation,<sup>3</sup> v. 21, ἀπερ ἵν κρυπτὰ in lieu of ἀπεκρύψας ταῦτα, may for the present remain undecided. In Luke xi. 2 also Marcion appears to have had the more original reading when in the Lord's Prayer, instead of the opening doxology, ἀγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομα σου, he gave a petition for the Holy Ghost, of which, however, we cannot now determine the phraseology, for this variation is also offered by other witnesses who cannot well have derived it from the Marcionite text; and this reading suits verse 13 incomparably better than the usual one; the latter therefore looks suspiciously like a correction from Matt. vi. 9.<sup>4</sup> Likewise the addition contained in Marcion's text (xxiii. 2)<sup>5</sup> does not look as if it originated with him, and as it is to be found in other witnesses, and would by no means be so striking in our Gospel as Volkmar (p. 196) considers (comp. *Acts xviii.* 13), it may be presumed that it was either genuine or introduced from an apocryphal Gospel at a very early date.<sup>6</sup> Finally, if

<sup>1</sup> See the proofs in *Griesbach's Symb. Crit.* ii. 271, 373. *Credner's Beiträge*, i. 248, &c. *Semisch*, *Die Ap. Denkw. Justin's*, 367, &c. *Hilgenfeld*, *Ev. Just.* 201, &c.; *Theol. Jahrb.* xii. 202, &c., 215, &c. Comp. *Baur*, *Markusev.* 199, &c.; *Volkmar*, *Ev. Marc.* 75, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. xviii.

<sup>3</sup> *Hilgenfeld*, *Tübingen Journal*, xii. 221.

<sup>4</sup> *Ritschl*, *Mark's Gospel*, 71. *Volkmar*, *Mark's Gospel*, 82, 196.

<sup>5</sup> It stands here, διαστρέφοντα τὸ Ἰησοῦς καὶ καταλύοντα τον νόμον καὶ τους πρόφητας καὶ κελεύοντα φόρους μηδ δοῦναι καὶ ἀνεστρέφοντα τὰς γυναικας καὶ τὰ τέκνα.

<sup>6</sup> Comp. *Hilgenfeld*, *Tübingen Journal*, xii. 241.

ch. v., after the uncompromising declarations concerning the new pieces and the old garments, the new wine and the old bottles (v. 36—38), the words of the 39th verse, καὶ οὐδεὶς πιὼν παλαιὸν εὐθέως θέλει νέον· λέγει γὰρ ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστότερος ἐστιν, must appear startling, the newest attempts at interpretation<sup>1</sup> have hardly been able to remove this stumbling-block. For the words οὐδεὶς θέλει, &c., in their connection with the preceding passage, must be taken by analogy with the οὐδεὶς ἐπιβάλλει in verse 36 and the οὐδεὶς βαλλεῖ in verse 37; in other words, in such a manner that the mode of action, the occurrence of which the speaker denies, is declared by his own lips to be perverse and inadmissible. But how can Jesus (or the Evangelist) describe the rapid transition from the old wine of Judaism to the new wine of the Gospel as an absurdity? And if it were possible to attribute to the words οὐδεὶς—νέον, the meaning which is, however, certainly not the most natural—you must not set before people their own old wine, if they are to relish your new wine, the difficulty still remains that the old is described as the best (*χρηστότερος*), which will deprive the partakers of their inclination for the rougher new wine. So far the absence of verse 39 in some manuscripts of our Luke, and its probable omission in Marcion, offer a desirable prospect of eluding a contradiction hard to bear; and the supposition that here also Marcion had the correct reading, and that verse 39 was appended later to modify the antinomianism<sup>2</sup> of the passage, has a preponderating probability on its side.<sup>3</sup>

It may be otherwise with regard to a passage which seems in some ways very similar to the one just discussed, namely, the sentence about the validity of the Law, Luke xvi. 17. It may certainly appear strange that immediately after the explanation

<sup>1</sup> *Volkmar*, 219, with which comp. *Hilgenfeld*, Tübingen Journal, xii. 213; *Köstlin* on the Origin and Composition of the Synoptical Gospels, 172, 304.

<sup>2</sup> *Hilgenfeld*, Gospel of Justin, Tübingen Journal, xii. 200. *Baur*, Gospel of Mark, 201.

<sup>3</sup> We may here pass by two other passages in which *Volkmar* considers Marcion's reading to be correct, i. e. xii. 38, where he has τῷ ἐσπερινῷ φυλακῇ, and xvii. 2, where he writes λαυτελεῖ αὐτῷ ἐι οὐκ ἔγεννήθη ἡ λίθος, &c., these variations being apparently quite objectless and dogmatically indifferent.

which so decidedly, and with such intentional divergence from the older reading,<sup>1</sup> pronounces the cessation of the Law in the kingdom of God, δέ νόμος καὶ οἱ φροφῆται ἔως Ἰωάννου, the sentence follows, εὐκοπώτερον δέ ἔστι τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν παρελθεῖν, ἡ τοῦ νόμου μίαν κεραίαν πεσεῖν; and this difficulty can scarcely be evaded by assuming<sup>2</sup> that the Law which is to remain valid is not to be understood as the Mosaic Law, but only as the universal Law of God; the moral, as the true substance of the Mosaic, Law. For in the New Testament, the expression δέ νόμος, without any more definite designation, never means anything, and especially in a context like this cannot mean anything, but the Mosaic Law. Hence if it is incredible that the author of our third Gospel, immediately after affirming the repeal of the Mosaic Law, should give such a positive statement of its eternal duration, we must join Hilgenfeld<sup>3</sup> and Baur<sup>4</sup> in sanctioning the Marcionite reading, τῶν λόγων μον, in lieu of τοῦ νόμου, unless, in consideration of the difficulty which Volkmar, not without reason, opposes to this acceptation, we give the preference to his conjecture (p. 212), τῶν λόγων τοῦ θεοῦ. But Volkmar himself (p. 210) justly refers us to the Pauline τὸν νόμον ιστᾶμεν (Rom. iii. 31), and although Paul would scarcely have appropriated the words of our 17th verse, yet the more faintly coloured Paulinism of the third Evangelist, blunted as it was by endeavours to effect a pacification, could scarcely have kept him back from adopting the old traditional word, providing only that it should not be taken contrary to the Evangelist's meaning as implying the unconditional validity of the Mosaic Law. This is just what he has done, and for this reason he has inserted it between two sentences which contradict its literal interpretation, so as to force a different construction upon the reader. The Law, he says, had reached its termination on the

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xi. 13: πάντες γάρ οἱ προφῆται καὶ δέ νόμος ἔως Ἰωάννου προεφήτευσσαν.

<sup>2</sup> Volkmar, p. 208.

<sup>3</sup> Gospel of Justin, Tübingen Journal, xii. 231.

<sup>4</sup> Critical Inquiries, 402. Gospel of Mark, 196. Ritschl has retracted his former opinion (Mark's Gospel, 97) in the Tübingen Journal, x. 531.

appearance of the kingdom of God (verse 16), but it has not therefore lost its power (verse 17); on the contrary, it has been rendered more stringent by the stricter precept of the Gospel (verse 18).<sup>1</sup> This meaning and this procedure cannot be considered incongruous with the spirit of our Evangelist, and the only case in which one might question whether it should be attributed to the primitive author of the Gospel would be, if on other grounds there might be reason to distinguish this primitive author from a later reviser, our Luke from the original Luke.

I should also be reluctant to maintain that in Luke xiii. 28, Marcion's reading, ὅταν ὁψησθε πάντας δικαίους ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, deserves the preference before ours, ὅτ. ὁψησθε Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ καὶ πάντας τοὺς προφήτας ἐν τ. βασ. τ. θ.<sup>2</sup> For though it would have coincided with the views of the third Evangelist to change (verse 27) the ἔργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν of Matthew (vii. 23) into ἔργάται τῆς ἀδικίας, in order to avoid the Judaistic employment of the saying against Pauline antinomianism, there was no necessity for recoiling from naming the patriarchs (after Matt. viii. 11); whereas Marcion, had he lighted upon them, would scarcely have been able to endure them, for the βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ could not so easily be reckoned to refer to the Paradise of the Creator as would have been the case with Abraham's bosom. Thus if we admit the possibility that the text of our Luke, if it originally resembled that of Marcion, was subsequently corrected out of Matthew, we have yet no sufficient reason for believing that such was the case.<sup>3</sup> Neither in ch. xii. would the omission of verses 6 and 7 improve the context in the sense of the Evangelist, explicable as it might be in

<sup>1</sup> Similarly *Köttlin*, p. 149. Otherwise it might be recalled that the continued observance of the Law by the Jews, and therefore by the Jewish Christians, was also taught in the Acts.

<sup>2</sup> *Hilgenfeld*, Gospel of Justin, 470. *Tübingen Journal*, xii. 227. *Baur*, Gospel of Mark, 206.

<sup>3</sup> *Hilgenfeld* indeed thinks πάντας τοὺς δικαίους is more appropriate on account of the antithesis with ἔργάται τῆς ἀδικίας; but to me, as to *Volkmar*, it seems on the contrary somewhat flat compared with our present text.

Marcion to have expunged these verses, which could not conveniently be construed as indicating either his good God or the Creator of the world. From the point of view of the Gospel, it was quite consistent for the admonition to fear divine punishment to be associated with the injunction to confide in the paternal providence of God; and as Matt. x. 28 offers the same combination, there is the less reason to consider it improbable in Luke.<sup>1</sup>

It seems much more likely that in the episode of the rich young man, Luke xviii. 19, Marcion has retained the primitive reading of Luke in the words, *μή* (or *τι*) *με λέγετε ἀγαθόν εἰς ἔστιν ἀγαθὸς ὁ πατὴρ*,<sup>2</sup> for numerous documents place it beyond doubt that this was the original form in which this saying was transmitted.<sup>3</sup> But as Justin quotes the reading found in the text of our Luke,<sup>4</sup> we must assume that Marcion here substituted the form with which he was already familiar for the one which stood in his codex, for the original text of Luke's Gospel must have undergone alteration before the time of Justin.<sup>5</sup> But even in ch. xxi. 18, our present text is scarcely contradictory enough to allow us to consider Marcion's omission of this verse (which this time Hilgenfeld<sup>6</sup> approves as well as Baur<sup>7</sup>) as evidence of the primitive text. At the first glance it certainly appears a glaring contradiction when it is said in verse 16, *θανατώσουσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν*, and in verse 18, *θρὶξ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν οὐ μὴ ἀπόληται*. How can Christ say that some of his followers shall be killed and yet not a hair of their heads shall perish? Nor is it enough to reply with Volkmar (p. 213) that *θανατοῦν* signifies only mortal *danger*, for this is just what the word does not mean. At the time especially when the Gospel was written, after the martyrdom of

<sup>1</sup> Volkmar, 214

<sup>2</sup> Or, *ὁ Θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ*; or perhaps, *ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*.

<sup>3</sup> More details on this point will be given in the chapter on Justin's quotation.

<sup>4</sup> This is shown in another place.

<sup>5</sup> So Hilgenfeld, Tübingen Journal, which has not however convinced me of the anti-Gnostic interest of our reading.

<sup>6</sup> Justin's Gospel, 471. Tübingen Journal, xii. 237.

<sup>7</sup> Mark, 202.

James, Paul and others, as Baur justly remarks, it could not be so understood. The solution is rather to be found on the other side. Verse 16 says that some of the disciples shall be killed, but verse 18 does not say that not a hair of theirs shall perish ; it is not the same to say, οὐδενὸς ἐξ ὑμῶν θρὶξ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς πεσεῖται, as in the Acts according to the recepta, or θρὺξ οὐ μὴ ἀπόληται ; the first expression alone conveys the promise that none shall be injured ; the second, on the contrary, leaves open the possibility that an injury may occur, but that it shall be fully repaired, for in this case also the sufferer has lost nothing. In a word, our 18th verse not only declares that Christians need have no fear for their bodies or their lives, but moreover that whatever they may lose in this respect will be restored to them at the resurrection ; which is likewise implied in verse 19; ix. 24; xvii. 33; xviii. 29. According to his views, Marcion would inevitably take offence at this saying, and at the care here bestowed on the body in general ; and thus the omission of the verse, if he encountered it, would be quite explicable. More striking is it that xvii. 10 should be wanting in Marcion, to whom this truly Pauline speech could scarcely have been repulsive,<sup>1</sup> and we must therefore suppose that he really did not find it in his text ; but, on the other hand, as the point of the previous discourse it sounds too consistent, and in its curt acuteness too characteristic, to be easily regarded as a subsequent addition. Hence we are disposed after all to consider it primitive, and the deficiency in Marcion as an inadvertency.

Meanwhile all this deals only with single variations in reading, and minute omissions or additions which would not be sufficient evidence of a post-Marcionite revision of the third Gospel, even should the Marcionite text prove correct in one or other of the cases in which we had reckoned ours to be the most authentic, or if the same should occur in some few passages in which we had disregarded Marcion's readings, considering them either as

<sup>1</sup> For the expression, δοῦλοι, to which *Hilgenfeld*, p. 274, and *Volkmar*, p. 99, adhere, is scarcely sufficient to account for this.

utterly unimportant or as obviously intentional alterations of the text. The supposition that the Gospel of our Luke underwent a second revision later than Marcion could only be founded on the relation of the Marcionite text to our present one, if its general complexion and important sections profoundly affecting the plan and tendency of the whole proved it to be the primitive version.

But that such was actually the case cannot be demonstrated by the mere comparison, to which we must here restrict ourselves, of the respective texts. This is plainly shown in the first and most important variation; in the question as to the opening of the Gospel. Marcion's Gospel, it is known, began, after one or two definitions of time which we read in Luke i. 3, with the descent of Jesus to Capernaum, Luke iv. 31, and the incidents there, to which were perhaps added the 38th and following verses; hereupon followed the occurrence at Nazareth, Luke iv. 15—30, which was however so much abridged in Marcion that Tertullian observes he promulgated nothing new at Nazareth, and was driven out only on account of an adage; then verse 20 (relatively verse 38) to 43; all the rest contained in our Luke, from i. 1—iv. 16, the whole introduction, the paragraph on the Baptist, the genealogy and the temptation, were wanting in Marcion.<sup>1</sup> But all these divergences may be explained by Marcion's dogmatic opinions, without premising the existence of any other than our Gospel text. That he was obliged to expunge the first two chapters, even if he found them before him, is obvious; just as little of course could he make use of the genealogy. Even though *ως ἐνομίζετο*, iii. 23, afforded the means of rendering it innocuous, it would at any rate have been a burdensome and inappropriate superfluity, which he could more easily remove by hewing his way wholesale to a suitable commencement; the laudatory description of the precursor John he was forced to omit, for how could the prophet of the Hebrew Deity be the forerunner of his Christ? and the same with the baptism in Jordan, which his Redeemer needed not, and which John could not impart to

<sup>1</sup> Volkmar, who seems to me to define the text most correctly in this part.

him. Neither was the history of the temptation adapted for the opening of his Gospel, even had it been otherwise compatible with his dogma, for this beginning could only have been made with the descent from heaven, the *κατῆλθε*, iv. 32, and an instant transportation of the descended Christ to the contest with the devil would have inflicted a serious injury upon him. Moreover, Marcion might have taken offence at the notion that the Christ of the good God should have required temptation from the devil before being allowed to enter on his ministry. Finally, that the incident at Nazareth should be placed after the appearance of Christ in Capernaum was necessitated by the commencement with *κατῆλθε*, and also because the appearance at Nazareth, the typical rejection of Christ in his paternal city, could receive such significant precedence only from one who looked on Nazareth as being in truth his native town. It is clear as day how little Marcion was able to employ in his text either the interpretation of Isaiah v. 17—21; the *πατρὶς*, verse 23; or the maxim in verse 24. In the whole of this paragraph, therefore, the form of Marcion's version is perfectly comprehensible even if Luke's Gospel lay before him exactly as we now possess it.

The next two somewhat more important gaps, owing to the omission of the speeches, xi. 29—32,<sup>1</sup> 49—51, are fully accounted<sup>2</sup> for by the import of these discourses, and although the first of these passages might perhaps by skilful interpretation be brought into harmony with Marcion's views, we are not justified in assuming that he expunged only when there was no other practicable expedient; for it is perfectly credible and likely that, being once engaged in criticising the traditional text, he may have withdrawn passages which he might possibly have preserved, as they only offered general difficulties; and granting that he did not always act quite consistently in this respect, we ought not to allow ourselves to be misled thereby, when an arbitrary alteration of text has been proved in the preponderating majority of cases. It is the same with regard to two small

<sup>1</sup> Commencing at the words *εἰ μή*.

<sup>2</sup> Volkmar, 58—60.

paragraphs, ch. xiii. 1—5, 6—9;<sup>1</sup> Marcion might perhaps have evaded what was repugnant to him in the threats of the 3rd and 5th verses, as he did xii. 46, xix. 27, by ascribing the punishment of the wicked to the Demiurge; still the difficulty here was greater, for as it was Christ himself who preached *μετάρουα*, destruction threatened those who refused to turn to Christ and his good God, and it must therefore be inflicted by the good God himself, which was contrary to Marcion's doctrine.<sup>2</sup> It might therefore appear more advisable to the Gnostic to strike out the whole passage In the second paragraph, the parable of the Fig-tree, it naturally disturbed him to find the people of Israel plainly distinguished as the vineyard of the good God, and this same God threatening their extermination. At any rate, these were the motives which impelled Marcion to omit the parable in xx. 9—18. Similarly the story of the Prodigal Son, in other respects so Pauline (xv. 11—32), as Baur likewise regards it (Mark's Gospel, 194), was probably cut out, merely because Marcion could not admit the Jewish people to be the son, still less the eldest son, of his God Whether the same hesitation caused the omission of xiii. 29, 30,<sup>3</sup> need not be discussed, for the idea that the Gentiles only take the place of the Jews in the kingdom of God is not so distinctly enunciated as to render any other explanation impossible, and this variation is of no importance in the question now before us. Perhaps Marcion only omitted the verses alluded to because they appeared superfluous after the vigorous conclusion of verse 28. But even had they been wanting in his copy of Luke, it would have made but little difference. That the short paragraph containing the lamentation over Jerusalem, Luke xiii. 31—35, was rejected by our Gnostic is in all probability correctly accounted for (Volkmar, 65) by the juxtaposition of Christ with the prophets, verse 33, and the

<sup>1</sup> For that this also was wanting seems to me to have been proved by Volkmar, p. 36, from Epiph. Schol. 38, as Hilgenfeld too also admits. Tübingen Journal, xii. 204.

<sup>2</sup> Volkmar somewhat differently, p. 102.

<sup>3</sup> Volkmar, 62. Hilgenfeld, Gospel of Justin, 466

preference for the Jewish capital shown in verse 34. Similarly the lamentation over Jerusalem in xix. 44 is wanting, only because the tears of Christ over the destruction of that city were incredible to Marcion, the enemy of Jews; at least this explanation is perfectly sufficient. The announcement of his suffering, xviii. 31—34, he was obliged to reject on account of the appeal to the prophecies of the Old Testament. The same applies to xx. 37, on account of the evidence quoted from the Pentateuch. The like consideration seems to have occasioned the omission of the short notice of the casting lots for the raiment, for the recollection of Ps. xxii. could hardly be avoided, although Luke himself does not expressly point to it. It is generally acknowledged that the history of Christ's entry into Jerusalem, xix. 20, harmonizes as little with Marcion's views as the violent expulsion of the traffickers from the Temple. If in the discourse on the destruction of Jerusalem (Luke xxi), besides the above-mentioned verse 18, the 21st and 22nd were also wanting in Marcion, this is accounted for by their purport; the special care for the Jews in the first, and the reference to the Old Testament in the second, could not possibly be agreeable to him. Of the four omissions in ch. xxii, the first two were inevitable for our Gnostic, as he could not tolerate either the eating and drinking in the kingdom of God, which are here not merely figurative, nor the special relation of the apostles to the twelve tribes of Israel with their judicial office. The injunction to buy a sword (verses 35—38) must also have appeared suspicious in the mouth of Christ; and from its connection with this he might be the more disposed to avoid the account of the sword-thrust, verses 49—51, which was at least indirectly caused by that word of Christ, and notwithstanding the subsequent reproach, proved that Jesus allowed his disciples the possession of weapons. The Gospel of Luke, on the other hand, if it originally contained verse 38, cannot have been deficient in the history of the sword-thrust<sup>1</sup> to which this

<sup>1</sup> The genuineness of which *Hilgenfeld* now also admits for these reasons, *Tübingen Journal*, xii. 241.

verse serves as an introduction. That Marcion should have omitted the word addressed by Jesus to his fellow-sufferer, xxiii. 43, might be sufficiently explained by his eschatology. That the passage was omitted in the original text of our Gospel can the less be inferred, as Marcion seems to have given the narrative itself, of which this word formed the indispensable point, and as it is also quite consistent with the spirit of the Pauline Gospel.<sup>1</sup> The various allusions to the Old Testament, xxiv. 25, 27, 32, 44—46, were of course intolerable to the Gnostic. If, finally, at the conclusion of the Gospel, verse 52 and probably also the last words of verse 47 and the second half of verse 49 were wanting, the necessity of these alterations is obvious.

From the above, it results that in several passages of the Gospel from which he compiled his own, he found a text differing from ours, which generally, if not always, has the appearance of superior primitiveness. When compared, however, with the whole, these passages are but few, and none of any intrinsic importance. On the other hand, Marcion not only assumes the existence of our present text in all the paragraphs in which he does not allow himself any variations—and these paragraphs are certainly the greater portion of the whole—but even where he diverges from it, his variations, including those of minor importance, may be sufficiently explained on the presumption that our Gospel was before him in its present form, and in most cases a mere comparison of texts permits no other supposition. Still this does not exclude the possibility that a portion of those variations may have belonged to the Gospel employed by him; and we shall return to this question later. Only we must not attempt here to found the proof of this assumption on the Marcionite text, for if in twenty cases Marcion wilfully made alterations from dogmatic motives, he may just as well have done so in the twenty-first; and the contrary supposition would have probability on its side only if no inducement could be discovered in his peculiar views to urge him to alter the text. That this is the case only

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *Volkmar*, 100, &c., 205, &c.

in few and less important passages has already been demonstrated.

It is true that we are not accurately informed *when* Marcion composed his Gospel. According to Irenæus, iii. 4, 3, the spread of Marcion's doctrine in Rome took place in the time of Anicetus, which is fixed with tolerable certainty between 150—160 A.D. It can scarcely be supposed that the renowned heretic was long in Rome without finding adherents. According to this statement he must have arrived about the year 150, or a little earlier. But we see from Justin's greater Apology, xxvi. 58, that at the time at which this writing was composed, Marcion had long been in activity, and had gained numerous followers in all parts, and hence had long entered on his reformatory peregrinations. Therefore if Justin, as it is generally supposed, wrote this work in the year 138 or 139, Marcion's appearance and influence on the Western Church must be placed at least twenty years earlier than his arrival in Rome according to Irenæus. Meanwhile, this assumption is by no means beyond question. Its chief support is the circumstance that at the beginning of the greater Apology, Marcus Aurelius is described, not as Caesar, but merely as the son of the Emperor Antoninus Pius. As the title of Caesar was employed<sup>1</sup> not only in formal addresses such as this, but even in private intercourse, it is inferred that at the time when Justin wrote his book, Marcus Aurelius could not have borne this title,<sup>2</sup> which he received in the year 139. But Justin himself subsequently mentions<sup>3</sup> a Cæsar, whoever he may have been, in a perfectly similar manner.<sup>4</sup> Thus he seems to have troubled him-

<sup>1</sup> Fronto, for instance, in his letters to M. Aurelius never neglects to append the title of Cæsar, although he was M. Aurelius's teacher and confidential friend.

<sup>2</sup> Thus, for example, among many others, *Semisch*, Justin Martyr, i 64, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Apol. ii. 2, where a Christian exclaims to the prefect of the city, Urbicus, οἱ πρέποντα Εὐσεβεῖ αὐτοκράτορι οὐδὲ φιλοσόφῳ (others, — *ou*) Καίσαρος παιδὶ οὐδὲ τῷ ιερῷ Συγκλήτῳ κρίνεται.

<sup>4</sup> It is disputed whether in the passage quoted above, αὐτοκράτωρ Εὐσεβῆς refers to Antoninus Pius or Marcus Aurelius, and consequently φιλοσόφος Καίσαρος παις to Marcus Aurelius or to his fellow-regent L. Verus. To me the first appears more likely, but in the present question it is of no importance; for as L. Verus was appointed

self little about official titles, or to have deemed the name of Philosopher more honourable than that of Cæsar; and hence nothing is proved by the omission of the title in the greater Apology. Should this circumstance prove inconclusive, we might be more inclined to attribute a somewhat earlier date, about the year 145, to the composition of the Justinian document. It is true it proves little that Justin himself, in Apol. i. 46, reckons 150 years from the birth of Christ, for we have no guarantee of the accuracy of his chronology, while on the other side the expression in the Dialogue with Trypho, which terms the Jewish war, ch. i., *νῦν γενόμενος*, is too vague to prove the more remote date of this and his preceding work. Again, the later origin of the first Apology is indicated by the fact that the writing is dedicated not only to Antoninus and Marcus Aurelius, but also to Lucius Verus; and that Verus, according to the most probable reading, is termed *φιλόσοφος*; for in the year 138, Verus was but eight years old<sup>1</sup>. Justin's statements concerning Marcion prove nothing against Irenæus, and we must decide on the opposite side. As Marcion was universally said to be somewhat younger than Basilides and Valentinus, which he could not be if in the year 138 he might be spoken of as he is by Justin in the greater Apology, this work must have been written later. However that may be, in no case do we know when Marcion first became acquainted with the Gospel of Luke. For as the variations of his Gospel from the text of our Luke are the result of his dogmatic system, it follows that this system at all events originated independently of that writing; and it is quite possible that he worked for a long time as a Gnostic teacher before the Pauline Gospel fell into his hands, and before he resolved on revising it: nay, this may possibly have occurred only after his arrival in Rome. On the contrary, it is equally possible that the

Cæsar and even Augustus by M. Aurelius immediately after his admission to the regency (Capitolin. Marc. vii. ver. 3, Clinton Fast. rom. A.D. 162), it is at all events a Cæsar who is named without mention of this title.

<sup>1</sup> He was born Dec. 15th, 130; Clinton, A.D. 145.

revision was made at a much earlier period. What the truth may be we cannot make out. Marcion's evidence is consequently doubly insufficient; first, because it does not guarantee the existence of the whole of our Gospel of Luke; and, secondly, because the date at which Marcion made use of it is so indefinite as to leave too wide a scope.

### 3. JUSTIN

In both respects we may receive more distinct information from Justin, that most important author, on the Gospel question. Though he mentions our Gospel of Luke as little as any of the other three, he proves his acquaintance with it by a series of quotations, some of which certainly, others most probably, are borrowed from it. Among them are the following passages:

1. As to the conception of Jesus and the annunciation, Justin says, *Apol* i 33: δύναμις θεοῦ ἐπελθοῦσα τῇ παρθένῳ ἐπεσκίασεν αὐτὴν καὶ κυνοφορῆσαι παρθένον οὖσαν πεποίηκε. καὶ ὁ ἀποσταλεὶς καὶ πρὸς αὐτὴν τὴν παρθένον κατ' ἐκεῖνο τοῦ καιροῦ ἄγγελος θεοῦ εἰηγγείλισατο αὐτὴν εἰπών· ἵδον συλλήψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ ἑκ πνεύματος ἄγιον καὶ τέξῃ υἱὸν καὶ υἱὸς ὑψόστου κληθήσεται καὶ καλέσεις το ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ, &c (according to Matt i. 21). *Tryph.* c. 100: Μαρία ἡ παρθένος εἰαγγειλιζομένην αὐτῇ Γαβριὴλ ἄγγέλου ὅτι πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' αὐτῇ ἐπελείσεται, καὶ δύναμις ὑψόστου ἐπισκιάσει αὐτὴν, διὸ καὶ το γεννώμενον ἐξ αὐτῆς ἄγιον ἔστιν υἱὸς θεοῦ, ἀπεκρίνατο γένοιτο μοι κατὰ τὸ ρῆμά σου. Except sundry omissions and a few insignificant additions and transpositions, these quotations coincide verbally with the account of Luke i. 26—38: ἀπεστάλη ὁ ἄγγελος Γαβριὴλ . . . πρὸς παρθένον . . . Μαριάμ . . . Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτῇ . . . ἵδον συλλήψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ καὶ τέξῃ υἱὸν καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν. Οὔτος ἔσται μέγας καὶ υἱὸς ὑψόστου κληθήσεται, &c. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἄγγελος εἶπεν αὐτῇ πνεῦμα ἄγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σὲ, καὶ δύναμις ὑψόστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἄγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς θεοῦ. . . . Εἶπε Μαριάμ· ἵδον ἡ δούλη κυρίου· γένοιτο μοι κατὰ τὸ ρῆμά σου. Our three other Gospels know nothing of the angel's visit to Mary, and his name likewise

appears in Luke alone (here and i. 19); and it is at least not recorded that this episode existed, especially *in the same words*, in any apocryphal Gospel. Thus, at the first glance, the supposition that Justin really had our Luke before him has much to recommend it. With Luke's, the record of Matthew must certainly be combined, for the words which in Matthew are spoken to the angel, Justin appends twice over to Gabriel's address to Mary. But such confusions of text are so frequent with him, and the above-mentioned forgetfulness is so natural, that these variations afford no ground for concluding that he had any other source of information than the two Evangelists just named. Just as little are we justified in drawing that conclusion from the harmonious rounding and internal consistency of Justin's representation<sup>1</sup>. Such smoothness consists only in the omission of the intermediate speeches which needlessly interfered with his immediate object. Now in this passage of the Apology his object was to point out the fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy in the birth of Christ from a virgin; and as for that he did not require the speeches, he passes them by entirely, whereas in Tr. c. he quotes the words of Mary (Luke i. 38). Little as this silence proves that they were altogether unknown to him, equally little can their partial quotation in the Dialogue with Trypho prove that they were only partially known to him; for in this passage also he has no intention of recording the whole story of the angel's embassy, he only wishes to carry out the idea, that as Eve in unbelief conceived sin and death, so on the contrary in believing confidence Mary conceived the Redeemer from sin and death. With this design he could of course notice only her trusting submission, verse 38, and not the previous hesitating question, verse 34. Thus, so far as more general reasons do not urge us to another view, this first passage makes it appear highly probable that Justin made use of our Luke.

2. In Justin's account of the birth and childhood of Christ we find a peculiar medley of various elements. That here at least

<sup>1</sup> As Hilgenfeld imagines. Justin's Gospel, &c., 145.

he employed an apocryphal Gospel was rendered apparent, first by Credner,<sup>1</sup> and recently by Hilgenfeld,<sup>2</sup> in opposition to Semisch, we are only concerned to know whether this Gospel was his sole source, or whether he had also before him one or the other of our canonical Gospels, and especially our Luke. The chief passage in which he comes into contact with the latter, Tryp lxxvii, runs thus: ἀπογραφῆς οὖσι ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ τότε πρώτης ἐπὶ Κυρηνίου ἀνελεύθει (ὁ Ἰωσὴφ) ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲτ ἔνθα φέκι εἰς Βηθλέεμ, ὅθεν ἦν, ἀπογράψασθαι· ἀπὸ γαρ τῆς κατοικούσης τὴν γῆν ἐκείνην φιλῆς Ἰουδαία τὸ γένος ἦν. . . . Γεννηθέντος δὲ τότε τοῦ παιδίου ἐν Βηθλέεμ, ἐπειδὴ Ἰωσὴφ οὐκ εἶχεν ἐν τῇ κώμῃ ἐκείνη ποῦ καταλῦσαι, ἐν σπηλαίῳ τινὶ σύνεγγυς τῆς κώμης κατέλυσε. Καὶ τότε ὅντων αὐτῶν ἐκεῖ ἐτετόκει ἡ Μαριά τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ ἐν φατνῇ αὐτὸν ἐτεθείκει. Besides this, Justin, Apol. i. 34, appeals against the Romans to the evidence, τῶν ἀπογραφῶν τῶν γενομένων ἐπὶ Κυρηνίου τοῦ ἴμετέρου ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ πρώτου γενομένου ἐπιτρόπου. Excepting by later apocryphal works dependent on our canonical Gospels, this census by Quirinus is mentioned by Luke alone of the Evangelists, and more than once Justin coincides verbally with that writer, compare Luke ii. 2: αὐτῇ γένετο ἡγεμονεύοντες τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου. Verse 4: ἀνέβη δὲ καὶ Ἰωσὴφ. . . . ἀπογράψασθαι. Verse 7: καὶ ἐτεκε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς. . . . καὶ ἀνέκλινεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ φάτνῃ διότι οὐκ γένετο τόπος ἐν τῷ καταλύματι. On the other hand, Justin speaks only of a census in Judæa, though he does not directly exclude<sup>3</sup> the further extension of this measure, and at the same time he converts the Syrian Governor Quirinus into the Procurator of Judæa. Further, while Luke takes Joseph to Bethlehem on account of his descent from David, Justin, who always connects the royal descent of Jesus with Mary only, gives the more vague and obviously inappropriate reason that Joseph belonged to the tribe of Judah.<sup>4</sup> From verse 8 and on-

<sup>1</sup> Contributions, i. 213.

<sup>2</sup> The place already referred to, 145, &c.

<sup>3</sup> For the words, Tr. 78, ἀπογραφῆς—πρώτης may also be rendered, “There was at that time a taxing, the first in Judæa.”

<sup>4</sup> Hilgenfeld, 140, 148.

ward, all that is peculiar to Luke—the appearance of the angels, the adoration of the shepherds, the circumcision, the presentation in the Temple—are nowhere alluded to by Justin. This certainly proves that for the history of the birth and childhood, Luke was not Justin's main authority; but it does not follow that he did not make use of him. His silence on the last-named subjects is abundantly explained, if we suppose that Matthew's narrative formed the original basis of his knowledge of this part of the Gospel history; and whatever could not be dovetailed into that, he made no use of, though he need not on that account have deemed it untrue. In this case the preference for Matthew was also recommended by the interest of pointing out the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecies, in the massacre of the innocents and the adoration of the magi. Whether Justin's procedure, with regard to the accounts of Joseph's descent from David, arose from his own reflection or from some evangelical tradition,<sup>1</sup> is of no consequence in the question before us. In no case does it follow that he had not under his eyes the record of Luke, which nowhere directly contradicts his statements; rather does the singular remark that Bethlheim was the paternal city of Joseph, for he was of the tribe of Judah, give the impression of being a supplementary alteration substituted for the appropriate reason presented by Luke, by one who on dogmatical grounds could not reconcile himself to referring the genealogies to Joseph. Just as little can any objection be offered to the supposition that it may be merely from inaccuracy that the census and the governorship of Quirinus are limited by Justin to Judæa—for that such, and far more important historical blunders, may be credited of him, is evident by the single assertion respecting the pillar-statue of Simon Magus. This opinion will at least have probability on its side until another source is discovered, of which it may be conjectured that it not only mentioned the census of Quirinus generally, but in exactly the same words as our Luke.

<sup>1</sup> Also the Proto-Gospel of James, c. 1, &c., c. 10, and the Gospel of the Nativity of Mary, c. 1, make Mary the descendant of David; comp. Strœns' Life of Jesus, 3 A. i. 174.

3. The saying of Jesus in Luke x. 13 is thus given by Justin, Tr. 76 : δίδωμι ὑμῖν ἔξουσίαν καταπατεῖν ἐπάνω ὅφεων καὶ σκορπίων καὶ σκολοπενδρῶν καὶ ἐπάνω πάσης δυνάμεως τοῦ εχθροῦ. In our text, τοῦ πατεῖν takes the place of καταπατεῖν; the words καὶ σκολοπενδρῶν are missing; and instead of ἐπάνω πασ. δυν., it runs, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν. These variations may certainly be derived from the employment of an apocryphal Gospel, for it is known how often one and the same saying is repeated in several accounts with only trivial differences; but it is also possible that they may owe their origin to mere inaccuracy, or that the marvellous σκολόπενδραι alone (millipede), derived from an uncanonical text, may in Justin's copy or his memory have become incorporated with our Luke, or that it may have been occasioned by the inadvertence of a copyist or the resemblance of the words σκορπίων and σκολοπενδρῶν both in look and sound. The quotation in question taken by itself offers no sufficient ground for a decision.

4. Tr. 51 says that Christ spoke thus concerning the cessation of prophecy with John and the termination of the old covenant: ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται μέχρι Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ ἔξότου ή βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται καὶ βιαστὰί ἀρπάζουσιν αὐτήν. Καὶ ἐθέλετε δέξασθαι, αὐτός ἐστιν Ἡλίας ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι. Οἱ ἔχων ὥτα ἀκούειν ἀκούετω. This citation gives the words of Jesus at the beginning in the characteristic form of Luke, for here we read, xvi. 16, ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται ἕως Ἰωάννου; while Matt xi. 13, with an essentially different meaning, says, πάντες γάρ οἱ προφῆται καὶ ὁ νόμος ἕως Ἰωάννου προεφήτευσαν. But after this, Justin (only his ἔξότου recalling the ἀπὸ τότε of Luke) reverts to the text of Matthew (verses 11, 12, 14 sq.), which he repeats verbally. Credner<sup>1</sup> and Hilgenfeld<sup>2</sup> are of opinion that this state of things cannot be accounted for by the fusion of texts written from memory. But why should this be incredible? Of several speeches mutually connected, Justin quotes the first from one, the rest from the other version, selecting whichever was most agreeable to him; in general he adheres to his chief Gospel, Matthew, but

<sup>1</sup> Contributions, i. 236.

<sup>2</sup> The above-cited work, 198.

he forsakes it where the text of Luke can serve his object better ; which is a very convenient and natural proceeding. In this case, moreover, the text of Luke xvi. 16 actually did suit him better than that of Matthew xi. 13. Justin wants to prove in the place, not only that after John no other prophet is to be expected from among the Jewish people, but also that the old covenant reached its conclusion through Christ;<sup>1</sup> and of these two assertions, Christ's speech, according to the reading in Matthew, establishes only the first, while the second is almost purposely negatived by the *προεφήτευσαν* ; therefore it was only in Luke that Justin was able to find what he required. For the rest, he naturally turned back to his more familiar Matthew, who alone, in connection with this subject, symbolizes John as Elias, a point of great weight in Justin's argument. Besides, the previous declaration that from the days of John the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence (*βιάζεται*, whereas Luke has *εναγγελίζεται*) and the violent take it by force, served to establish Justin's statement (in the place) concerning the appearance of heretics and false prophets as foretold by Christ. Thus, even in this instance, we have no motive for going beyond the authorities known to us, in order to seek for an explanation of the Justinian citations ; although as far as we have proceeded we cannot deny the possible existence of a Gospel text corresponding exactly with Justin's quotations.

5. The words of Jesus to the rich young man, Apol. i. 16, οὐδὲς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ μόνος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποίησας τὰ πάντα, in all the texts known to us, coincide only with the parallel reading in Luke xviii. 19 and in Mark x. 18 : τὶ με λέγεις ἀγαθόν ; οὐδὲς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἰς, ὁ θεὸς ; only that Justin omits the preliminary question, substitutes εἰς for μόνος, and adds the words, ὁ ποίησας τὰ πάντα. Matt. xix. 17 is the best accredited reading : τί με ἐρώμενος περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ; εἰς ἔστιν ὁ ἀγαθὸς, ὁ θεὸς. In the Dialogue with Trypho, c. 101, the same saying is quoted thus : τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν ; εἰς ἔστιν

<sup>1</sup> Εἰρήκει δὲ περὶ τοῦ μηκετὶ γενήσεσθαι ἐν τῷ γένει ὑμῶν προφῆτην, καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἐπιγνῶναι ὅτι ἡ πάλαι κηρυσσομένη ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ καινὴ διαθήκη διαταχθήσεσθαι ἡδη τύτε παρῆν, τουτεστιν αὐτος ὡν ὁ Χριστὸς, οὕτως.

ἀγαθὸς, ὁ πατὴρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Verbally similar is the Ophite extracted by the false Origen, Philosoph. v. 7: *τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν;* εἰς ἔστιν ἀγαθὸς ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; but he then subjoins, in a somewhat divergent form, the words of Matt. v. 45, as if the whole constituted but one saying. We have already met with a kindred reading in Marcion. Similarly the Marcosians read, in Iren. i. 20, 2, *εἰς ἔστιν ἀγαθὸς, ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς;* and likewise the Clementine Homilies in four places (iii. 57; xvii. 4; and more fully xviii. 1, 3), *μή με λέγε ἀγαθὸν, ὁ γὰρ ἀγαθὸς εἰς ἔστιν, ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.* At a later period this reading still appears in the quotations of the Fathers of the Church.<sup>1</sup> If such facts place it beyond doubt that the quotation in the Dialogue with Trypho is derived from written authority in this its peculiar form, and if we are compelled with Hilgenfeld<sup>2</sup> to condemn as a whim the theory of Semisch that the different parallel or kindred variations arose independently of each other by similar free combinations of our canonical text, we are also obliged to derive the citation in the Apology from our Luke. For if Justin found our saying in his uncanonical Gospel in *that* form in which it is presented by the Dialogue with Trypho, the only possible authority remaining to us for the other reading is in Mark and Luke. In this case, even disregarding the mutual relation of the two, the decision must be given in favour of Luke, from the fact that, as Hilgenfeld has now again exhaustively shown, Justin's acquaintance with Mark is neither proved nor even rendered probable. And the same circumstance also refutes the supposition,<sup>3</sup> which would otherwise be substantially indifferent with regard to Justin's relation to our third Gospel, that the quotation in the Apology was taken from Mark, and the one

<sup>1</sup> *Credner, Contributions*, i. 253; *Semisch, Memorabilia of Justin*, 370; *Hilgenfeld*, 220.

<sup>2</sup> Page 372; where it is further justly remarked, the words on which the Marcosians lay the greatest stress, as opposing the Catholica, and which they expressly take for granted in their explanation of the passage, cannot be considered a mere mistake of memory.

<sup>3</sup> *Volkmar, Gospel of Mark*, 198.

in the Dialogue with Trypho from the original reading of Luke which is still preserved by Marcion (see above); for if the Gospels otherwise known to have been employed by Justin are capable of accounting for all his citations, we have no right to fall back upon another with which his acquaintance cannot be proved

6. Connected with the passage above discussed is also the saying in Luke xviii. 27, which we find again in Justin, Apol. i. 19, with the same divergences from the text of Matthew:<sup>1</sup> τὰ ἀδύνατα παρὰ ἀνθρώποις δυνατά ἔστι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ (Justin has only δυνατὰ παρὰ θεῷ) It is still less possible to doubt that this quotation also is derived from Luke

7. Justin's statements respecting the prophetic announcement of the suffering and resurrection of Jesus not only coincide almost throughout with Luke in expression, and especially in all the points in which he differs from the other two Synoptists,<sup>2</sup> but likewise in substance they contain a proposition which is found in no other of our Evangelists (xviii. 31; xxiv. 44), namely, that Jesus represented his suffering as the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies. If, therefore, Justin had one of our canonical Gospels before him, it could only have been Luke. It is true the variations in expression, trifling as they are in themselves, acquire greater importance by their three-fold repetition, and an extra-canonical source might therefore be conjectured; but as

<sup>1</sup> xix. 26: παρὰ ἀνθρώποις τοῦτο ἀδύνατόν ἔστι παρὰ δὲ τῷ θεῷ πάντα δυνατά.

<sup>2</sup> Tr. 76 quotes as a saying of Jesus δεῖ τὸν νὺν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων καὶ σταυρωθῆναι καὶ τῷ τρίτῳ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι. The same in c. 100, verbally similar, except that instead of γραμμ. κ. Φαρισ., it is Φαρισ καὶ γραμμ. In c. 51 it is more brief. Christ announces, ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ ὅτι διὰ αὐτὸν πολλὰ παθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων καὶ σταυρωθῆναι καὶ τῷ τρίτῳ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι; and c. 106: ὅτι καὶ πρὸ τοῦ παθεῖν ἐλεγεν αὐτοῖς, ὅτι ταῦτα αὐτὸν δεῖ παθεῖν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν προφητῶν ὅτι προκεκίρυκτο ταῦτα Comparing this with Matt. xvi. 21; Mark viii. 31; Luke ix. 22, it appears that Justin's quotation in Tr. lxxvi. 100 only differs from Luke ix. 22 in three points; instead of ὑπὸ τ. γραμμ. κ. Φαρισ., Luke has ἀπό τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ γραμματέων; instead of σταυρωθῆναι, ἀποκτανθῆναι; instead of ἀναστῆναι, ἠγρέθηναι, which is, however, to be found in Luke xxiv. 7, in a speech of like import. Besides this, there are found in Mark several insignificant, and in Matthew more important deviations from Luke and Justin.

these variations substitute only what is more usual and common, in the place of what is less usual, and as moreover the whole of the quotations belong to the same work, there is nothing to hinder the hypothesis of a free alteration of Luke's text.<sup>1</sup>

If, moreover, Hilgenfeld's conjecture should be confirmed, that Justin's uncanonical Gospel was also the special authority which served as a basis for our Mark, it would be further endorsed by the fact that Justin's slight deviation from Mark (*τὴν τρίτην ἡμέραν*; Mark says, *μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας*) coincides with the text of Luke, and it may hence be presumed that he is more likely to have taken his quotation from Luke, than from the authority employed by Mark.

8. The well-known utterance about the resurrection runs thus in Justin, Tr. 81: *ὅ κύριος ἡμῶν εἶπεν, ὅτι οὐτε γαμήσοντιν οὐτε γαμηθόσονται ἀλλὰ ισάγγελοι ἔσονται, τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ὄντες.* That this quotation can be derived from none of our Evangelists save Luke (xx. 34) there can be no doubt; Matt. xxii. 30 and Mark xii. 25 diverge from it much more. Moreover, on this theory it is perfectly explicable; for as the speech of Christ is only rendered indirectly, no verbal accuracy or completeness can be expected, and it therefore brings no imputation upon him that Justin omits a small sentence contained in Luke, that he changes *γὰρ* into *ἀλλὰ*, and that for *γαμοῦσιν* and *ἐκγαμίσκονται*, he substitutes *γαμήσοντιν* and *γαμηθόσονται*. But the concluding words, *τέκνα—ὄντες*, certainly rather striking at first, look quite as if they had arisen from a false construction or a garbled reading of Luke's text, *καὶ νιοί εἰσι τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως νιοὶ ὄντες.* If in this case also we find nothing to refute the general possibility of an extra-canonical authority, neither is there anything positive to convince us of its existence.

9. Justin's account of the institution of the Last Supper, Apol. i. 66, can be more definitely traced to Luke (xxii. 19) as well as to Matthew,<sup>2</sup> as it contains several of the distinctive features of Luke's representation. The Apostles, says Justin, in

<sup>1</sup> Hilgenfeld also acquiesces in this, 211.

their Memorabilia, the so-called Gospels, have told us : λαβόντα ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου τοῦτο ἔστι τὸ σῶμά μου· καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὅμοίς λαβόντα καὶ εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν τοῦτο ἔστι τὸ αἷμα μου, καὶ μόνοις αὐτοῖς μεταδούναι. Now we find here in the first half, relating to the distribution of bread, not only the εὐχαριστήσας of Paul and Luke,<sup>1</sup> but also the characteristic token of the Pauline-Lukan representation, the words, *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*, &c.; for it is of course quite unimportant that Justin says ἀνάμνησίν μου, instead of ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. Both, however, are elsewhere repeated. In Tr. 41, Justin terms the bread of the Last Supper the ἄρτος τῆς εὐχαριστίας, ὃν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους . . . ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν παρέδωκε ποιεῖν; and in c. 70 it is said, περὶ τοῦ ἄρτου, ὃν παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν . . . ποιεῖν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν, &c., καὶ περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου, ὃ εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ παρέδωκεν εὐχαριστοῦντας ποιεῖν. Should it be assumed that Justin owed these touches to any other than our Luke, the known dependence of the latter on the Pauline representation (1 Cor. xi. 23) shows that he must have derived them either directly from Paul or from a Gospel closely adhering to him. Yet the first is unlikely. From the attitude which he assumed towards Paul and Paulinism, Justin would scarcely have employed the Pauline Epistles in this manner; and besides, in his narration he expressly appeals to the apostolic Memorabilia, the Gospels. But the other must likewise seem improbable so long as no Gospel can be pointed out which was used by Justin, and which stands in the same relation to Paulinism as that of Luke. Even if this could be done, still it would not be the most natural proceeding to attribute the words which we find in our Gospel to another, of which we cannot positively know whether it contained them. In that case we should require special grounds for denying Justin's acquaintance with our Luke. The fact that he traces back his record to the Memorabilia of the Apostles, not of the Apostles' disciples, would not justify this course; for as he generally adheres to

<sup>1</sup> Matthew xxvi. 26, and Mark xiv. 22, have εὐλογήσας at the bread and εὐχαρ at the cup.

Matthew, he may for convenience sake have described his authorities *a parte potiori* as apostolic memorabilia.

10. In Tr. 103 we read: Καὶ τό· ὡσεὶ ὑδωρ ἔξεχύθη καὶ διεσκορπίσθη πάντα τὰ οστᾶ μου· ἐγενήθη ἡ καρδία μου ὡσεὶ κηρὸς τηκόμενος ἐν μέσῳ τῆς κοιλίας μου (Ps. xxii. 14), ὑπερ γεγονεν αὐτῷ ἐκείνης τῆς νυκτὸς ὅτε ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἔξηλθον εἰς τὸ ὅρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν προαγγελίᾳ ἦν. Ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι, ἃ φημι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολουθησάντων συντετάχθαι, ὅτι ἴδρως ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι κατεχεῖτο αὐτοῦ εὐχομένου καὶ λέγοντος παρελθέτω, εἰ δυνατὸν, τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο, ἐντρόμου τῆς καρδίας δηλονότι οὕτης καὶ τῶν οστῶν δμοίως ἔουκίας τῆς καρδίας κηρῷ τηκομένῳ εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν, &c. That these words can be traced to Luke xxii. 44 as well as to Matt. xxvi. 39 (from whom come παρελθέτω, &c.), can the less be doubted, as Luke is the only one of our Evangelists who mentions the sweat-like drops, and as Justin here expressly reminds us that the Gospels were composed by the Apostles and their *disciples*; for though we cannot here, any more than in Papias, refer the words τῶν ἐκ. παρακολούθ to the prologue of Luke, they yet contain a distinct allusion to the work of an apostolic follower such as our Luke. The slight difference that Justin says ἴδρως ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι, and Luke ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἷματος,<sup>1</sup> is of no importance. For, in the first place, Luke does not speak of a bloody sweat, and the comparison with drops of blood is merely to betoken that, as Jesus prayed, the sweat flowed down in heavy drops. Secondly, θρόμβος by itself might signify drops of blood,<sup>2</sup> and even if it were not so, Justin had sufficient reason for omitting the αἷματος, for he wants here to point out the fulfilment of the words in the Psalm, ὡσεὶ ὑδωρ ἔξεχίθην, which would have been only impaired by the θρόμβοι αἷματος.

11. In the same passage of the Dialogue, Justin mentions that Pilate sent Jesus bound to Herod as a means of showing him attention. The only Gospel which to our knowledge narrates

<sup>1</sup> Credner, Contributions, i. 227.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Semisch, Apostol. Denkwürdigkeiten. Just. 145.

this occurrence is that of Luke, xxiii. 6, and there is nothing in the Justinian passage which leads us to suspect any other source. This place must therefore be reckoned among those which testify Justin's acquaintance with our third Gospel.

12 It is exactly the same with Tr 105, where the words of Jesus before his decease are thus quoted with express appeal to the Memorabilia: *πάτερ εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμα μού*; verbally similar with Luke xxiii. 46, only that here some of our witnesses read *παραθήσομαι* instead of *παρατίθεμαι*. It is quite unknown to us that these words were contained in any Gospel excepting that of Luke. The most natural hypothesis in this case also will be that Justin borrowed his quotation from Luke.

The conclusion which appears to result from all this evidence, i.e. that Justin not only knew but frequently made use of our Gospel, is opposed by Hilgenfeld in the often-mentioned work, with the remark that his coincidence with Luke is to be explained with greater probability by their common dependence on a third source, and he seeks this, after Credner's example,<sup>1</sup> in a Petrine Gospel, most likely identical with the Mark-Gospel known to Papias, the basis of our Mark and the connecting link between Matthew and Luke. In this manner not only is the accordance in the introductory history of Justin and of Luke (Nos. 1 and 2 above) to be explained (p. 143), but even the utterance of Jesus in the discourse to the seventy disciples (verse 3), and the whole story of the mission of the seventy is traced back to the Petrine Gospel (p. 286), which moreover is supposed to have contained the declarations to which Justin refers (No. 7, p. 289). Why should it not also have originally had (p. 289) the sending of Jesus to Herod, the drop-like sweat, the last word of the dying Jesus (p. 289)? Here only must we look for the proper source for the speech No. 4 assumed by Hilgenfeld (p. 198); and the same scholar seems to have no other opinion with respect to No. 6, when he merely concludes from the verbal consonance of Justin's quotation with Luke (p. 224)

<sup>1</sup> Contributions.

that Justin employed a text in harmony with the latter. Just so the statement regarding the condition of the risen, No. 8, only suggests a *text closely allied* to Luke, but not the text of Luke himself, because the accordance is not quite verbal (p. 226); and if the Pauline features in the history of the institution of the Last Supper are more likely to be borrowed from Luke than from Paul, they may yet have been contained in Justin's "favourite Gospel" also (p. 235). Of only one citation, that quoted in the greater Apology (in No. 5), will Hilgenfeld admit that it is demonstrably derived from Luke or Mark, because the parallel passage in the Dialogue with Trypho is taken from the Petrine Gospel (p. 223). This accordingly would be the sole and not very certain vestige of Justin's acquaintance with our Luke; while for the rest we must hold the Petrine Gospel to be the original source of all the features common to Justin and Luke, and little is wanting for the discovery of a new Justinian primitive Luke as a compensation for the Marcionite one.

We must now ask, Is this view necessary and reliable, is it demanded by the peculiarities of the Justinian text, and is it capable of accounting for them?

So far as the above-mentioned quotations are concerned, we must answer the first of these questions in the negative. We have assured ourselves that these quotations can be fully accounted for by means of our Luke and Matthew. But this does not decide the question. Granting it to be demonstrable on other grounds that Justin was not acquainted with our Luke, we should be compelled after all to trace these apparently Lukian quotations to a third source common to both. But such demonstration can scarcely be made. It has indeed been observed that Justin cannot have known<sup>1</sup> the two episodes, in Luke ii. 41 (of Jesus at twelve years of age) and xxii. 49—51 (the sword-thrust), and therefore he cannot have known the Gospel in which they were contained. With regard to the first, this is assumed from

<sup>1</sup> Ritschl, *Gospel of Mark*, 146, 148. Hilgenfeld, work already quoted, 152, 288; comp. Credner, *Contributions*, i. 228. Schwegler, *Nach-Apostol. Zeitalter*, i. 232.

his silence alone. Now it is true it would have been very appropriate to mention it in the passage, Tr. 88, and its omission must appear striking; but yet it cannot be said that, even if Justin were acquainted with Luke, this silence would be perfectly incredible. Why should it be impossible for him once to overlook a suitable testimony, especially when it occurred only in a Gospel which he employed merely in a subordinate manner, and from which he had not originally derived his knowledge of the evangelical history? The story of the sword-thrust<sup>1</sup> Justin appears to contradict not only by his silence, but by his positive assertion that not a single individual came to the rescue of Jesus when he was taken prisoner (Tr. 103). Strongly as it may be conjectured that he derived this statement from the same Gospel to which he owed the notice, missing in our canonical Gospels, of the universal desertion on the part of the disciples (Apol. i. 50; Tr. 59, 106), it is yet equally improbable that he should have known no Gospel at all which recorded this event so unanimously recounted by our Evangelists. In his zeal for tracing the fulfilment of Ps. xxii, he must therefore either have ignored it or have somehow brought it into harmony with his preconception. Nothing more is implied, as we have already observed, by the persistency with which Justin speaks of the Davidical descent of Mary, ignoring, if not excluding, that of Joseph (see above No. 2); for as he did not yet regard the Gospels as sacred or inspired writings, nothing hindered him from handling them with the same freedom as any other historical authority. Finally, when Hilgenfeld (p. 291) expects from Justin, as a native Samaritan, some consideration for the references to Samaria (Luke ix. 51; x. 30; xvii. 11), he himself renders the answer obvious by pointing out, as the characteristic of the Justinian representation, that the Samaritans and Jews are both included under the collective name of Israelites (Apol. i. 53). The in-

<sup>1</sup> Which after all is attributed to Peter by John alone, but by the older tradition to a follower of Jesus. Hence the omission cannot be explained, as it is by Credner (p. 261) and by Hilgenfeld (240, 269), by the interest of a Petrine Gospel in the person of Peter.

terests of a Judaizing Samaritan Christian, such as Justin, were much more fully satisfied by this expedient than by the occasional intercourse of Jesus with the Samaritans recorded by Luke. If the Samaritan race was absolutely identified with the Jewish stock, the entire ministry of the Messiah belonged as much to one as to the other ; those subordinate communications could be dispensed with ; and so far as Justin recognized their actual import—the extension of the labours of Jesus beyond the limits of Judaism, and the receptivity of the pagan Samaritans contrasted with the obduracy of the Jews—they were directly incompatible with his fundamental idea.

If we must call in question Hilgenfeld's view with respect to the basis on which it is founded, we cannot refrain from doubting the possibility of its being completely carried out. It is indeed undeniable that Justin made use of an uncanonical Gospel, and on this subject Semisch has been triumphantly refuted by Hilgenfeld. That this Gospel bore the name of Peter, or of his interpreter Mark, and was identical with the Mark of Papias, seems to us quite probable ; that in addition to Matthew (and Luke) it constituted a chief source of our Mark, we might likewise conjecture ; that it was one of the "many" alluded to by Luke in his preface is at least possible. But when Hilgenfeld carries the accordance of this Gospel with our Luke so far as to attribute all but one of Justin's apparent quotations from Luke to the Petrine Gospel, he seems to us to outstep the bounds of probability. It is true, such a proceeding is not absolutely incredible. Assuming that we know as little of our Matthew as we know of the Petrine Gospel of Justin, how many quotations from Matthew would we feel disposed to refer to Mark or to Luke ? But the matter which Justin derived from Luke is not a mere indifferent element which might have appeared equally well in any other Gospel, but it clearly bears the stamp of its origin, the characteristics of the Lukan representation. The utterance in Luke x. 19 (No. 3 above) forms part of the exhortation to the seventy disciples. And the history of the mission of

the seventy disciples is so closely interwoven with the whole tendency of the third Gospel that we can scarcely avoid holding it to be its own original property;<sup>1</sup> and if Hilgenfeld<sup>2</sup> endeavours to render it probable that Justin's "Petrine" Gospel knew the Seventy, his proofs, as it appears to me, are not adapted to lead us from the vague possibility of this hypothesis to its probability or even to its historical admissibility. His chief argument is, that in several points in the vicinity of this narrative Mark harmonizes with Luke, and that here the one as well as the other follows the Gospel of Peter. It ought, however, first to be proved that Mark did not take these traits from our Luke himself; and even then the main thing, the mission of the Seventy and the exhortation addressed to them, are still wanting in him, and it must therefore be surmised that it was also wanting in the Gospel of Peter. The narrative in question bears throughout the specific character of Luke's Paulinism. Be it observed how strikingly Luke places the Twelve in the background comparatively with the Seventy; how briefly he treats their mission, ix. 1—6; how little result he can tell of their labours, and with what preference, on the other hand, he delineates the mission of the Seventy and its brilliant success (x.); how the exhortation to the Twelve recorded by Matthew (x. 5) is abbreviated by Luke in order to apply the greater part of it to the Seventy; how the celebrated saying of the Lord which in Matt. xi. 25 can only be addressed to the Twelve, is by Luke, x. 21, appended to the return of the Seventy. Let it not be overlooked that, in contradistinction to the twelve Jewish Apostles, the Seventy not only represent the mission to the heathen by their symbolical number, but are still more clearly marked out by several traits as the representatives of the *Pauline* mission to the Gentiles; that it is the principles of the Pauline missionary labours, the

<sup>1</sup> *Baur*, Krit. Untersuchung, &c., p. 435. The Gospels, their Spirit, &c.; Lpz. 1845, p. 82. *Schwegler*, Nach-Apostol. Zeitalter, ii. 45.

<sup>2</sup> The Clement. Recogn. 66; Das Evang. Just. 286; also *Köttlin's Origin and Composition of the Synoptic Gospels*, 267.

utterances of Paul himself (1 Cor. ix. 6; x. 27), which Jesus here (x. 7, &c.) even verbally in part enacts as law; that it is an incident in the life of Paul (Acts xxviii. 3) by which the promise in Luke x. 19 was more literally fulfilled than by any other occurrence in the New Testament; that Paul above all others would benefit by the words in Luke x. 20, as the honour was grudged him by the Jewish Christian party (Rev. xxi. 14); and that immediately antecedent to the story of the Seventy, a small anecdote is given (Luke ix. 41) which seems as if calculated for the vindication of Paul<sup>1</sup>—take all these marks together, and ask if a narrative conducted so entirely in the Pauline interests, and so expressly emphasized by the Evangelist himself in accordance with those interests, could form a consistent part of the “Gospel of Peter.” What could be the object of it in Jewish Christian tradition? Hilgenfeld is of opinion that it was the resemblance to the Elders of Moses. But this motive seems much too insignificant to give rise to a narrative which might become so dangerous to the reputation of the Apostles; and still less is it likely that Jesus himself should have engaged in the selection of the Seventy on such grounds as these. Kostlin holds that the Seventy represent the mission to the heathen in a position originally subordinate to the Twelve; they were derived from a writing which still restricted the twelve Apostles to the Jewish people, and yet endeavoured to adapt itself to the circumstances of a later period by extending the Messianic salvation to the Gentiles. But if this was a Jewish-Christian Petrine writing, as he assumes, it remains quite inconceivable that it should not have taken the simpler way of transferring the heathen mission directly to the twelve Apostles. Whoever, after the manner of the Jewish Christians, regarded only the twelve Apostles of Palestine as the actual Apostles of Christ, could recognize the extension of the Messianic salvation to the Gentiles only by including them in the sphere of apostolic duty: the division of the Jewish and Gentile missions to different individuals equally commissioned

<sup>1</sup> *Kostlin, Origin and Composition of the Synoptical Gospels.*

by Christ himself, could have but one motive, that of a Paulinist who acknowledged the existence of an Apostle of the Gentiles in addition to the Apostles of the Jews. Precisely because the Seventy are as directly authorized and sent forth by Christ as the Twelve, is the equal title of both declared; while, on the contrary, the Jewish opponents of Paul denied his equality with the primitive Apostles because he was not called directly by Christ. Hence the Seventy can never have been subordinate to the Twelve, but on a level with them from the first; and a Paulinist only, not a Petrinist, can have created this counterpart of the Apostles of the Jews. The course pursued by the Jewish-Christian faction, when the right of Gentile Christianity had once been conceded, is best shown in the legends of Peter, his journeys in the West, his ministry in Rome and Corinth. In order to avoid acknowledging an independent Apostolate of the Gentiles, the most distinguished of the Palestinians was converted into a Gentile Apostle, and charged with the founding of communities which in truth were the offspring of Paul, of ambassadors to the Gentiles besides the twelve Apostles, selected like them by Christ in person. This could not possibly be admitted by Judaism. And in fact we find in Jewish Christian tradition no trace of the seventy disciples. Matthew knows them not; Mark has assuredly not passed them by inadvertently; the author of the Clementine Homilies, although he knew Luke's Gospel, and perhaps employed the charge to the Seventy, makes no mention of themselves; only in the Recognitions (see below) are they alluded to. But this mention can scarcely be derived from the old Ebionite basis of the work to which it has recently been attributed. Hence the episode of the Seventy can belong originally only to the Pauline Gospel, to Luke; and what Justin quotes from it must have been derived from him. If, nevertheless, the words of our quotation are to be traced to another source, it must be assumed that they originally referred to the twelve Apostles, and were only transferred by Luke to the Seventy, together with the discourse of instructions

in Matthew. But as Justin was at all events acquainted with our Luke, we have not the slightest ground for this assumption ; and as the words cited by him are specially fulfilled in the life of Paul, it is also quite improbable in itself.

The case is similar with respect to the declaration No. 4. That a saying originally intended to signify merely the termination of Old Testament prophecy should be converted by the Pauline Gospel into an announcement of the end of the Old Covenant, cannot be thought surprising. But in the Petrine Gospel this feature would be strange ; for that, according to the original meaning of the expression as it stands in Justin, the efficacy, not the validity, of the Old Testament religion came to an end in the New Covenant,<sup>1</sup> is a distinction too refined to be tenable, and moreover it refutes itself by the above-quoted declaration of Justin, who found in his text the cessation of the Old Covenant itself. Far more readily could it be admitted that the sayings referred to by Justin in the passages quoted in No. 7 had their original home in the Gospel of Peter. However, a comparison of the passages, Acts ii. 27 ; xxvi. 22 (x. 43 ; ii. 23), with Luke xviii. 31 ; xxiv. 25, 44, renders it evident that Luke especially attached peculiar value to the prophetic announcement of the suffering of Christ ; and this is not surprising in a Paulinist, for whom the suffering of Christ had a far more independent importance than for the Ebionites. Now why should we search for Justin's saying, not in the Gospel which he is proved to have known and in which the feature in question is to be found, but in another of which we do not in the least know that it contained it ? Of the narrative respecting the sending of Jesus to Pilate, Hilgenfeld himself says (p. 289<sup>2</sup>) that it is fully accounted for by the characteristic tendency of the third Gospel ; this attempt of Pilate to induce the Jewish rulers to confirm the innocence of Jesus only casts the guilt of his death more strongly on the Jews. "But does not this tendency," he asks, "very well

<sup>1</sup> *Hilgenfeld, Gospel of Justin, 200.*

<sup>2</sup> *After Baur, Critical Inquiries concerning the Gospels, p. 489.*

suit the character of the Gospel of Peter also, with the Roman interest which it displays, and with the tendency designed especially for the Gentile world ?” But that this tendency existed in the “Gospel of Peter” is inferred by Hilgenfeld, if we are not mistaken, only from passages in Luke, which he assumes were also contained in the Gospel of Peter. Here again, therefore, his proof moves in a circle. If we abandon this, the tendency of the “Gospel of Peter” becomes quite an unknown quantity, with which we cannot contend against a known quantity, i. e. the tendency and contents of our Luke. The claim of the latter to the narrative under discussion is enforced, not only by its consistency with the general bias of the Gospel, but also by the passage in Acts iv. 27, which at all events shows that Luke regarded it as particularly important, and by the persistent endeavour of this work to give prominence to the culpability of the Jews in rejecting the Messianic salvation. Remarkable too is the similarity of motive for the hearing of Christ before Herod, and of Paul before Agrippa. As from the former the conviction is reached (Luke xxiii. 14), *οὐδὲν εἰρόν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ αἴτιον . . . ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ Ἡρώδης . . . οὐδὲν θανάτου ἀξιον ἔστι πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ*, so does the author in the latter express the impression attributed to Agrippa in corresponding words (Acts xxvi. 31), *οὐδὲν θανάτου ἀξιον η δεσμῶν πράσσει ὁ ἀθρωπός οὗτος*. Unless everything deceive us, Luke is not indebted for his narrative to any more ancient Gospel. The words of Jesus also before his death (No. 12) are confirmed as the genuine property of Luke by their analogy to the narrative of the death of Stephen (Acts vii. 59) and the anachronism respecting Quirinus; this notably false statement, with its apparent accuracy, has such striking parallels in the anachronism in the Acts concerning Theudas, in Luke iii. 2 and Acts iv. 6, that we have every reason for attributing them to the author of Luke’s Gospel and not to his authorities. Finally, if Justin did not draw directly from Paul, himself for his account of the institution of the Last Supper, which is more likely; that he made use of our Luke, or that his

Petrine Gospel closely resembled the Pauline representation in its most essential features? How, on the whole, are we to conceive of this Jewish-Christian Gospel if it contained all that Hilgenfeld so confidently believes? if not only a universalism within the bounds of Ebionite ideas, after the manner of the Clementine Homilies, but also open Paulinism, outspoken opposition to Judaism, found a place in it. How strange that our Mark, the alleged epitomizer of the Petrine document, in so many cases leaves us in the lurch just where the most distinctive characteristic of its chief source in its separation from Matthew would become apparent!

One important criterion is here afforded us by the language. If the various sayings in which Justin verbally or nearly verbally coincides with Luke were derived not from him but from the Gospel of Peter, we should be forced to conclude that in a great portion of his work Luke adhered to this Gospel with scrupulous fidelity, for it would be incredible that this relation should occur exclusively in the passages cited by Justin. But then it would be difficult to account for the uniformity and idiosyncrasy of his style, which a later portion of this work will render evident in the Gospel as well as in the Acts. It is true he has extracted a great deal verbally from Matthew, but far more frequently has he made alterations. And if to the passages borrowed from Matthew we add a number of verbal extracts from the Gospel of Peter, we could scarcely understand how a writer so dependent on others could have preserved one and the same individuality of style in two works, of which one was certainly derived from sources quite different from the other. But even in Justin's brief quotations, the language of Luke cannot be entirely misapprehended. At least the *ὑψιτος* and *νιός ὑψιτον*, Luke i. 32, 35, belong specifically to Luke (see below); *ἐπισκιάζειν*, except in the synoptical account of the transfiguration and in Luke i. 35, is to be found only in Acts iv. 15; the combination of *πνεῦμα* and *δύναμις* is pre-eminently liked by Luke (see below); *παραθέειν*, Luke xxiii. 46, otherwise not a word of

common occurrence, appears five times in the Gospel and four times in the Acts; *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*, employed by Justin to describe the angel's message to Mary, except in the Pauline Epistles and in 1 Peter, is known only to Luke, who frequently makes use of this word, and especially in Luke i. 19; ii. 10, in a precisely analogous application. Taking all these indications together, we have every reason for continuing to attribute to our Luke all Justin's quotations in the cases above adduced.

If we regard it as established beyond doubt that the Gospel of Luke was employed by Justin, it is a comparatively unimportant question whether he took it into consideration in other passages besides those mentioned. But there may be an inclination to regard this supposition as more or less probable in several other instances. Thus the mention of Elizabeth as the mother of the Baptist (*Trypho*, 8, &c.) may refer to Luke i. Just so the passage in *Trypho* about the expectation of the people concerning John and some of the words of John may have arisen from Luke iii. 15, though the words, *'Ιωάννου καθέζομένου ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου*, seem to betray the influence of an extra-canonical authority.<sup>1</sup> Whether in the quotation in *Apol.* i. 15, *οὐκ ἥλθον καλέσαι δικαιόντας, ἀλλὰ ἀμαρτωλὸν εἰς μετάνοιαν*, the last two words proceed from Justin or from Luke or from some one else cannot be decided, although Luke differs from Matthew and Mark in giving them; and if the saying in *Apol.* i. 16, *τῷ τύπτοντι σον τὴν σιαγόνα πάρεχε καὶ τὴν αλλην*, &c., might be traced to Luke vi. 29, the deviations of the Justinian from the Lukan text are considerable, especially as Justin has several times unmistakably made use of an extra-canonical authority in connection with this passage. The discourse too against the Pha-

<sup>1</sup> The same expression is found, evidently not without significance, in Tr. 51: *Ἐτ δὲ Ιωάννης μὲν προελήνθε βοῶν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις μετανοεῖν καὶ Χριστὸς ἐπὶ αὐτῷ καθίζομένου ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ποραμοῦ επελθὼν ἐπανότε τε αὐτὸν τοῦ προφητεύειν καὶ βαπτίζειν, &c.* The *καθίζεσθαι* of the Baptist is here an unmistakable contrast to the active wanderings of Christ, and the Baptist himself appears in a limited character similarly, as in Clem. Hom. ii. 28. Is not this view in conformity with a more ancient representation?

risees, who tithe mint and cummin and forget judgment and the love of God (Tr. 17), closely resembles Luke xi. 42, although the quotation is not quite certain.

This is the case in a still smaller degree with a number of other passages, which have been likewise attributed in whole or in part to our Luke. Among these are the assertion, in Tr. 88, about the youth and first public ministry of Jesus, compared with Luke ii. 40; iii. 23; and Tr. 49, about the imprisonment of the Baptist, compared with Luke iii. 19, for in both these instances the resemblance of Justin's quotations to the passages in Luke is very slight; also Apol. i. 15; Tr. 96, γίνεσθε χρηστοὶ καὶ οἰκτίρμονες (comp. Luke vi. 55; Clement. Hom. iii. 57); Apol. i. 16, 63, ὃς γὰρ ἀκούει μου καὶ ποιεῖ ἡ λεγω (c. 63, shorter, ὁ εμοῦ ἀκούων) ἀκούει τοῦ ἀποστείλαντος με, compare Luke x. 16; Tr. 17, οὐαὶ ὑμῖν γραμματεῖς, ὅτι τὰς κλεῖς ἔχετε, &c., comp. Luke xi. 52, Matt. xxiii. 14;<sup>1</sup> Apol. i. 17, φ τπλέον ἔδωκεν ὁ θεὸς πλέον καὶ ἀπαιτηθήσεται παρ αὐτοῦ, comp. Luke xii. 48; Apol. i. 16, ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ἐργάται τῆς ἀνομίας, where only the ἐργάται (instead of ἐργαζόμενοι) reminds us of Luke xiii. 27, while the other expressions, and especially the characteristic ἀνομία, for which Luke substitutes ἀδικία, harmonize with Matt. vii. 23; Tr. 25, οὗτοι οἱ δικαιοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς, comp. Luke xvi. 15; Apol. i. 13, ὃς γαμεὶ ἀπολελυμένην ἀφ' ἔτέρου ἀνδρὸς μοιχᾶται, comp. Luke xvi. 18; Matt. xxi. 13; Apol. i. 17, ἡρώτων αὐτὸν εἰ δεὶ Καίσαρι φόρους τελεῖν, comp. Luke xx. 22; Matt. xxii. 17; Tr. 101 (the scoffing at Jesus on the cross), where the slight accordance with some of Luke's expressions (Luke xxiii. 35) arises from their common dependence on Ps. xxii. 7. In all these passages the assonance with Luke's characteristics is insignificant and easily explained by accidental coincidence. It appears somewhat more important in the discourse on the love of enemies and on charity in Apol. i. 15, Tr. 153, when compared with Luke vi. 27, 30, 34, and Matt. v. 42. But here we find such striking deviations from the

<sup>1</sup> Comp. also the form of the same saying, Clem. Homil. iii. 18; xviii. 16, and the observations to be made thereon below.

synoptical texts, that it becomes very questionable whether the final source of this quotation is to be sought in them. The same applies to the saying about the greatest commandment, Tr. 93, Apol. i. 16, which from its equivocal relation to Luke x. 27 and iv. 8 (Matt. xxii. 37; iv. 10), cannot be traced with certainty to either of these passages. Several other quotations, notwithstanding their partial affinity to passages in Luke, seem by their relation to apocryphal texts to be of extra-canonical origin. So in the account of the baptism of Jesus in Jordan, Tr. 88, 103, the character of which is placed beyond doubt by several peculiar statements which recur in uncanonical Gospels;<sup>1</sup> Apol. i. 63, Tr. 100, οὐδεὶς ἔγνω (Tr. γινώσκει) τὸν πατέρα, &c., the well-known reading, the relation of which to Luke x. 22 has already been discussed with reference to Marcion; Apol. i. 19, μὴ φοβεῖσθε τὸν ἀναιροῦντας ἡμᾶς καὶ μετά ταῦτα μὴ δυνάμενον καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα εἰς γέενναν ἐμβαλεῖν, in which the Clementine Homilies, xvii. 5, and Clement's Second Epistle to the Corinthians, c. 5, offer a text which is nearly allied to Justin's, and occupies a similar relation to that of Matthew (x. 28) and Luke (xii. 4); Tr. 53, 106; Apol. i. 50, where the reiterated assertion that at the crucifixion of Jesus the Apostles deserted him, and subsequently repented of this desertion, distinctly points to a special source, to which perhaps the expression (Tr. 106), ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ ἐστη τῶν ἀποστόλων may also belong. Finally, in many instances in which the relation of the quotations to our Gospel is undoubted, the authenticity of the Justinian writing is so much the more questionable. This applies not only to those books which are now universally acknowledged to be spurious, but fragments relating to the resurrection must likewise be included in the verdict. Hence if this writing, c. 8, has respect to Luke vi. 32, c. iii. to Luke xx. 34, c. ix. to Luke xxiv. 38, it does not materially affect the question before us.

It thus appears that Justin knew and employed our third

<sup>1</sup> Credner, Contributions, i. 237. Hilgenfeld, as before, 164.

Gospel; but relatively to the whole of his Gospel quotations, the use he made of it seems to have been limited, and we must therefore conclude that our Gospel had not in his eyes the same importance as those of which he made more extensive use, and that it was not the original source of his knowledge of the evangelical history. Where and when it first came into his hands cannot now be known.

That Justin also knew the Acts cannot be proved; and it cannot be positively denied, only because a quotation from this work could not have been expected from him, even had he been acquainted with it. Let Acts i. 8, &c., be compared (besides c. 9 of the spurious work on the Resurrection) with Apol. i. 50: *εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνερχόμενον ἴδόντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες καὶ δύναμιν εκεῖθεν αὐτοῖς πεμφθεῖσαν παρὰ αὐτοῦ λαβόντες καὶ εἰς πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων ἐλθόντες ταῦτα ἐδίδαξαν καὶ ἀπόστολοι προσηγορεύθησαν*—with Acts ii. 30, Tr. c. 68: *Καὶ ὁ Τρύφων· πῶς οὖν ὁ λόγος λέγει τῷ Δαβὶδ, ὅτι ἀπὸ τῆς ὄσφυός αὐτοῦ λήψεται αὐτῷ οὐδὲν ὁ θεὸς καὶ κατορθώσει αὐτῷ τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ καθίσει αὐτὸν ἐπὶ θρόνου τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ*—with Acts iv. 27, Apol. i. 40: *πῶς μηνύει (τὸ πνεῦμα) τὴν γεγενημένην Ἡράδον τοῦ βασιλέως Ἰουδαίων, καὶ αὐτῶν Ιουδαίων καὶ Πιλάτου . . . σὺν τοῖς αὐτοῦ στρατιώταις κατὰ Χριστοῦ συνέλευσιν*, comp. Ps. ii.—with Acts vii. 21, compare Coh. ad Gr.<sup>1</sup> c. 10 (Μωσῆς), πάσης τῆς Αἰγυπτίων παιδεύσεως μετασχεῦν ἡξιώθη διὰ τὸ ὑπὸ θυγατρὸς βασιλέως εἰς παιδὸς φύκειώσθαι χώραν—with Acts xii. 44, the same, c. 29: *Γέγραφε γὰρ Μωσῆς ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ τῆς σκηνῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰρηκότος οὕτως . . . ὅρα ποιήσεις κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δεδειγμένον σοι ἐν τῷ ὅρῃ*—with Acts x. 14, Tr. 20: *μὴ πάντα ἐσθίοντες οὐ διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὰ κοινὰ ἡ ἀκάθαρτα οὐκ εσθίομεν*—with Acts xiii. 27, 48, Apol. i. 49: *Ἰουδαῖοι γὰρ ἔχοντες τὰς προφητείας καὶ ἀεὶ προσδοκήσαντες τὸν Χριστὸν παραγενησόμενον ἡγνοησαν (scil. τὰς προφητείας) οὐ μόνον δὲ, αλλὰ καὶ παρεχρήσαντο· οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν . . . πληρωθέντες χαρᾶς καὶ πίστεως τοὺς εἰδώλους ἀπετάξαντο, &c.*—with Acts xvii. 23, Apol. ii. 10: *πρὸς θεοῦ δὲ, τοῦ ἀγνώστου αὐτοῖς, διὰ λόγου ζητήσεως*

<sup>1</sup> A writing of very doubtful origin.

ἐπίγνωσιν προύτρέπετο (ὁ Σωκράτης)—with Acts xxvi. 22, Tr. 36 : ὅτι παθητὸς Χριστὸς προεφητεύθη μέλλειν είναι . . . καὶ ἐνδοξὸς μετὰ τὴν πρώτην αὐτοῦ παρουσίαν . . . ἐλευσόμενος καὶ κριτῆς πάντων, and the same 76 : εἰ γὰρ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν παρακεκαλυμμένως κεκήρυκτο παθητὸς γενησόμενος ὁ Χριστός καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πάντων κυριεύσων—with Acts xxvi. 29, Tr. 8, Βουλοίμην δ' ἄν καὶ πάντας ἵσον ἐμοὶ θυμὸν ποιησαμένους μὴ ἀφίστασθαι τῶν τοῦ σωτῆρος λόγων. Nevertheless, among all these parallels, especially those from genuine writings, there is not one that could not be most naturally accounted for by the accidental accordance of authors belonging to the same age and the same circle, and handling kindred topics, even if, in one and another of the passages above mentioned, a reminiscence of the Acts and the assumption of Justin's acquaintance with the book are quite supposable.

The pseudo-Justinian Epistle to Diognetus has extremely few passages which remind us of Luke, and these few prove nothing. For what does it signify if in c. 11 Christ is termed οὗτος ὁ ἀεὶ, σήμερον υἱὸς λογισθεὶς, for the precedent in Ps. ii. 7 is more obvious than Luke iii. 22; if in c. 6 it is written, χριστιανὸι τὸν μισῶντας ἀγαπῶσιν, a maxim which the author was as little obliged to draw from Luke vi. 27 as from Matt. v. 44; if c. 11 (*μαθηταῖς . . . οἱ πιστοὶ λογισθέντες ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ ἔγνωσαν πατρὸς μυστήρια . . . ἀπέστειλε λόγον, ἵνα κόσμῳ φανῆ ὡς ὑπὸ λαοῦ ἀτιμασθεὶς, διὰ ἀποστόλων κηρυχθεὶς, ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν ἐπιστεύθη*) exhibits some similarity of meaning to Acts xii. 46—48; and c. 3 (ὁ γὰρ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ πᾶσιν ἡμῖν χωρηγῶν ὃν προσδέσμεθα, οὐδένεος ἄν αὐτὸς προσδέοιτο τούτων ὃν τοὺς οἰομένους διδόναι παρέχει αὐτὸς) to Acts xvii. 24, although, with the exception of the last passage, the resemblance is sufficiently remote. Moreover, a much more decided coincidence would have implied little, considering the probably late origin of the writing alluded to.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Compare with this my remarks in the Tübingen Journal, iv. 619.

#### 4. IGNATIUS, POLYCARP, THE CLEMENTINE HOMILIES AND RECOGNITIONS.

The Ignatian Epistles<sup>1</sup> are in all probability somewhat more recent than the chief works of Justin. But although these Epistles have respect in many ways to Gospel narratives and statements, even the commentators who are in general ready enough to assume quotations from the New Testament are in this instance unable to perceive any reference to our third Gospel, and as little can any real trace be discovered of an acquaintance with the Acts. Ign. Smyrn. c. 3<sup>2</sup> is supposed to recall Acts x. 41: οἵτινες συνεφάγομεν καὶ συνεπίομεν αὐτῷ μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν; and Ign. Philad. c. 2,<sup>3</sup> Acts xx. 29: εἰσελεύσονται μετὰ τὴν ἀφίξιν μου λύκοι βαρεῖς εἰς ἡμᾶς. However, not only is the second of these parallels obviously quite inconsiderable, but the first can prove nothing either, for it was undoubtedly a wide-spread tradition that Jesus ate and drank with the disciples after the resurrection; and as our canonical Gospels (Luke xxiv. 30, 41; John xxi. 13) were not necessary for the propagation of this tradition, neither were the Acts obliged to express it briefly in the most convenient words, *συμφαγεῖν* and *συμπιεῖν*.

The alleged Epistle of Polycarp is so closely connected with the Ignatian Epistles that the view of its origin and authenticity will always go hand in hand with the verdict on the Ignatian Epistles. For our part, we can only attribute<sup>4</sup> its composi-

<sup>1</sup> On the origin of these see *Baur* in the Tübingen Periodical, 1838, 3, 149; *The Ignatian Epistles*, p. 57; *Schwegler*, Post-Apostolic Age, ii. 159. The conviction of their spuriousness which I share with these scholars has not been shaken by the last work of *Uhlhorn* (in *Niedner's Periodical for Historical Theology*, 1851, i. 4; ii. 247). But I quite acquiesce in the opinion given first by *Baur* and now by *Uhlhorn* also, on the Syrian recension of the Epistles.

<sup>2</sup> μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν συνίφαγεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ συνέπιεν ὡς σαρκιδες, καίπερ πνευματικῶς ἥμαμένος τῷ πατρὶ.

<sup>3</sup> πολλοὶ γάρ λύκοι δέξιοιστοι ἡδονῇ κακῷ αἰχμαλωτίζουσι τοὺς θεοδρόμους.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. besides *Schwegler*, Post-Ap. Age, ii. 154; also my remarks, *Tübingen Journal*, iv. 586, vi. 144. What the most recent champion of the Ep. of Polycarp

tion to a period subsequent to the death of Polycarp, which occurred A.D. 167. It is, however, all the more remarkable that the only passage which sounds like our third Gospel must in reality be derived from an extra-canonical writing. In c. 2 it is said, *εἰπεν ὁ κύριος διδάσκων· μὴ κρίνετε ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε· ἀφίετε καὶ ἀφεθησεται ὑμῖν· ἐλεεῖτε ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε· ἐν φῷ μετρῷ μετρεῖτε ἀντιμετρηθῆσεται ὑμῖν.* Now of these four injunctions the first accords verbally with Matt. vii. 1, less accurately with Luke; the second with Matt. vi. 14 in sense, but only partially in words; with Luke, on the contrary, only remotely; the third has no parallel in the New Testament, for Luke vi. 36 does not belong here; the fourth most nearly suggests Matt. vii. 2; Luke vi. 38 only remotely. On the other hand, c. 1 (*χριστὸν δν ἔγειρεν ὁ θεος λίνας τὰς ὡδίνας τοῦ ἄδου*) appears to refer to Acts ii. 24 (*δν ὁ θεὸς ἀνέστησε λίνας τὰς ὡδίνας τοῦ θανάτου*); for even if the expression *ἀδίνεις τοῦ ἄδου* (or *θανάτου*), originating in the inaccurate Alexandrian translation of *חַבְלִי הַפּוּתָה*, Ps. xviii. 5, had belonged to the general dogmatic phraseology, the similarity of the two passages in other respects would be almost too great to admit of this solution; whereas c. 8 (*ἐὰν πασχῶμεν διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ δοξάζωμεν αὐτὸν*) is as far from containing an allusion to Acts v. 41, as Polycarp's Martyrdom, c. vii. (*τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ γενέσθω*), does to Acts xxi. 14.

While thus the Pauline authors of the Ignatian Epistles and of Polycarp's letter made no use of the specially Pauline Gospel, we find it at the same time in the hands of the Ebionites, with

(*Ritschl*, Rise of the Old Apostolic Church, 604) adduces in behalf of its authenticity can prove little. The evidence of Irenæus, for instance, on which he lays great stress, loses nearly all its weight by the fact, evident from the fragment of *Eusebius*, Hist. Ecc. v. 20, that Irenæus was only a boy when he saw Polycarp, and from that time was never at all connected with him; for such a relation naturally does not guarantee Irenæus' acquaintance with Polycarp's literary works. When Ritschl himself is compelled to remove the chief objections to the authenticity of this Epistle by the admission of frequent interpolations, it only proves to us that its genuineness, as it now lies before us, cannot be maintained; and how are we justified in cutting out, according to taste, whatever is unsuitable? As, however, Ritschl fixes the date of the Epistle between 140—168, his view does not affect us in the present inquiry.

whom the Clementine Homilies originated. Out of the large number of Gospel quotations which are found in this work, we select the following, which strikingly coincide with the discourse to the seventy disciples : Hom. xix. 2, καὶ ὅτι ἑώρακεν τὸν πονηρὸν ὡς ἀστραπὴν πεσόντα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐδήλωσεν. Comp. xi. 35, ἵνα μὴ ἡ κακία ἡ τῷ κυρίῳ προσδιαλεχθεῖσα ἡμερας τεσσαράκοντα, μηδὲν δυνηθέσθαι, ὑστερον ὡς ἀστραπὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ γῆς πεσούσα, &c. There is no doubt that these passages refer to the saying of Christ transmitted by Luke x. 18 (*ἐθεώρουν τὸν σταυρᾶν ὡς ἀστραπὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα*), and that they are derived from our Luke is all the more likely, as the neighbouring verse, Luke x. 20,<sup>1</sup> re-appears in Hom. ix. 22 in the words, ἀλλ' ὅμως κἀν πάντες δαιμονες μετὰ πάντων τῶν παθῶν ὑμᾶς φεύγωσιν οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τούτῳ μονῷ χαίρειν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ δὶ εὐαρετίαν τὰ ὄνόματα ὑμῶν ἐν οὐρανῷ ὡς ἀεὶ ζώντων ἀναγραφῆναι. In these two passages, therefore, Hilgenfeld<sup>2</sup> is right in not allowing Credner's doubts<sup>3</sup> to impede his acceptance of their Lukan parentage. If, however, the author of the Clementine Homilies knew and made use of the passage in Luke respecting the Seventy, it is probable that Luke x. 24 (*πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ βασιλεῖς ηθελησαν ἰδεῖν ἃ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε*) influenced the form of words in Hom. iii. 53, which run thus : πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ βασιλεῖς ἐπεθύμησαν ἰδεῖν ἃ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε καὶ ἀκοῦσαι ἃ ὑμεῖς ἀκούετε, καὶ ἀμὴν, λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐκ εἶδον οὔτε ἥκουσαν ; for in Matt. xiii. 17 the nearest parallel passage there stands, πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ δίκαιοι. But here, in consequence of the deviation of the quotation from either of our Evangelists, the hypothesis of an extra-canonical text is also admissible, which might have connected the saying as little as Matthew does with the mission of the Seventy. In Hom. iii. 30 also, the reminiscence of passages in Luke seems to have affected the colouring of the expression. The words run thus : ὁ ἀποστέιλας ὑμᾶς . . . ταύτην (τὴν εἰρήνην) ὑμῖν ἐνετείλατο προφάσει προσηγορίας

<sup>1</sup> πλὴν ἴν τούτῳ μὴ χαίρετε ὅτι τὰ πνεύματα ὑμῖν ὑποτάσσεται· χαίρετε δὲ ὅτι τὰ ὄνόματα ὑμῶν ἐγράφη ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

<sup>2</sup> Gospel of Justin, &c., 357.

<sup>3</sup> Contributions, i. 324.

πρὸ τῶν τῆς διδασκαλίας λόγων ὑμῖν ἐπιφθέγγεσθαι, ἵνα ἔάν τις ὁ ἐν ὑμῖν εἰρήνης τέκνον διὰ τῆς διδασκαλίας ὑμῶν καταλάβῃ αὐτὸν ἡ εἰρήνη, εἰ δὲ ταύτην λαβεῖν ὑμῶν τις μὴ θέλοι, τότε ἡμεῖς ἀποτίναξάμενοι εἰς μαρτυρίαν τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν τὸν ἐκ τῶν ὄδῶν κονιορτὸν, διὸ διὰ τοὺς καμάτους βαστάσαντες ἡνέγκαμεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὅτις σωθῆτε, εἰς ἑτέρων ἀπίωμεν οἰκίας καὶ πόλεις. This quotation harmonizes in general with Matt. x. 12—14, but the words underlined have no parallel in Matthew, and recall Luke ix. 5 : εἱερχόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης καὶ τὸν κονιορτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν ἀποτινάξατε εἰς μαρτύριον ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, and c. x. 5 f. 11 ; εἰς ἦν δ' ἄν οἰκίαν εἰσέρχησθε, πρῶτον λέγετε εἰρήνη τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ. Καὶ ἔὰν ὁ ἐκεὶ νίὸς εἰρήνης, ἐπαναπαίστεται ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν, &c. (εἰπατε) καὶ τὸν κονιορτὸν κολληθέντα ὑμῖν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὑμῶν ἀπομασσόμεθα ὑμιν. Now although the accordance is by no means verbal, and though the conclusion of the Clementine passage at any rate shows a misapprehension with respect to the shaking off the dust, the connection in which the sayings are found in Luke renders a reference to them probable in the Homilies. For the same reason, we should be inclined to trace the words in Hom. iii. 71, ἀξιός ἔστιν ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ, to Luke x. 7,<sup>1</sup> although the proverb-like phrase may have been current independently of our Gospels. It is also quoted in 1 Tim. v. 18, in the same acceptation as in Luke, on which it is possibly dependent, in conjunction with the saying about the labouring ox, as derived (*γραφῇ*) from the Old Testament.

Another, and to us not unimportant passage, is to be found in Hom. xvii. 5, παραβολὴν εἰς τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐπάγει τὴν ἐρμηνείαν λέγων εἰ οὖν ὁ κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας ἐποίησεν οὕτως διὰ τὸ ἐκάστοτε ἀξιωθῆναι, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὁ πατὴρ ποιήσει τὴν ἐκδίκησίν τῶν βοώντων πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός ; . . . ποιήσει, καὶ ἐν τάχει. As this has no parallel in the New Testament except in Luke xviii. 6 ff., and as nothing is known of any tradition elsewhere respecting the unjust judge, and as moreover with regard to the expression, the two passages, notwithstanding the freedom of the quotation, coincide

<sup>1</sup> Matt. x. 10 *αὐτοῦ*, instead of *τ. μισθοῦ* : τῆς τροφῆς.

precisely in the idioms which most readily impress the memory, the derivation of it from Luke can scarcely be doubted.

That the parable of the rich man and Lazarus was known to the author of the Homilies is clear from Hom. ii. 13: *ἴνα μὲν ὁ κακὸς ἐν ἀδη γενόμενος, ὡς ἐνταῦθα τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἀπολαβὼν, ἐκεῖ περὶ φυῆμαρτεν κολασθῆ, ὁ δὲ ἀγαθὸς . . . ἐκεὶ ὡς ἐν κόλποις δικαίων ἀγαθῶν κληρονόμος καταστῆ,* since thought and expression accord too much with Luke xv. 23, 25, for the consonance to be accidental. But as Luke in all probability borrowed the story as far as verse 25 from an Ebionite writing,<sup>1</sup> the Homilies may have also derived it from the same source.

More decidedly might we trace back to Luke xxiii. 34 (*πάτερ ἄφεις αὐτοῖς οὐ γὰρ οἴδασι τί ποιοῦσι*) the words which are attributed to the dying Redeemer in Hom. xi. 20, *πάτερ ἄφεις ἀντοῖς τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν, οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν ἃ ποιοῦσιν*, if a more ancient source were not suggested by the fact that in the Ebionite martyr-legend of Hegesippus (in Eus. Hist. Eccl. ii. 23), James the Just, while being stoned, is made to pray, *κύριε θεὲ πάτερ ἄφεις αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οἴδασι τί ποιοῦσιν.*<sup>2</sup> Now it is certainly quite credible that Hegesippus, or whoever gave that legend its latest form, may have had our third Gospel before his eyes; and it speaks for this view that, besides the verbal accordance, Hegesippus in the words immediately preceding those above quoted, *ἔθηκε τὰ γόνατα λέγων*, comes into contact with the account of Stephen's death recorded in the Acts, vii. 60; and as not only does this account appear to be formed on the model of the death of Jesus in the Gospel narrative, but as also in Acts iii. 17, xiii. 27, the behaviour of the Jews against Jesus is regarded in the same view as in Luke xxiii. 34, we have the greater reason for looking to Luke as the original source of the words of Jesus, especially when the acquaintance of the Homilies with his Gospel has already been established. The possibility, however, still remains

<sup>1</sup> See my observations, Tübingen Journal, 1843, 626. Schwegler, Post-Apost. Age, ii. 65.

<sup>2</sup> As Hilgenfeld justly reminds us.

that the saying may have been transmitted by a more ancient writing employed by Luke; and as its occurrence in Hegesippus affords some support to this theory, the probability of Luke having been employed can scarcely be raised up to full certainty.

The saying on prayer in Hom. iii. 56 shows a mixture of Matthew and Luke. The first part differs from Matt. vii. 9 and accords almost word for word with Luke xi. 11: *τίνα αἰτήσεις οὐδὲ ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ; ἢ καὶ ἵχθυν αἰτήσει, μὴ δόξιν ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ;* but it then turns to Matt. vii. 11, with which the conclusion coincides verbally. That our two Evangelists were really employed can only be doubted on the assumption that Luke borrowed his reading of this speech, with the exception of the 12th verse and the variation in the 13th, from the same Gospel from which the author of the Homilies took his. The possibility of this we cannot deny, but we cannot consider it probable.

Hom. viii. 7 seems to refer to Luke vi. 46 (*τί δέ με καλεῖτε κύριε κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ἀλέγω*) in the words: *ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἡμῶν πρός τινα πυκνότερον κύριον αἰτὸν λέγοντα, μηδὲν δέ ποιοῦντα ὃν αὐτὸς προσέτασσεν ἔφη· τί με λέγεις κύριε, κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖς ἀλέγω;* for the proximate occasion of the speech adduced in the Homilies may very well have been added by their author. On the other hand, for Hom. xv. 5: *δίκαιον ἔφασκεν εἶναι καὶ τῷ τύπτοντι αὐτοῦ τὴν σιαγόνα παρατιθέναι καὶ τὴν ἑτέραν, καὶ τῷ αἴροντι αὐτοῦ τὸ ἴμάτιον προσδιδόναι καὶ τὸ μαφόριον, ἀγγαρεύοντι δὲ μίλιον συναπέρχεσθαι δύο καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα*—an extra-canonical source might be presumed, as this form of the well-known precept cannot be fully explained from either Matt. v. 39 or Luke vi. 29; and if the *μαφόριον* clearly enough betrays an Ebionite variation of the traditional text,<sup>1</sup> it is nevertheless to be supposed that this alteration had already been adduced in the Gospel used by that party.

Other points of contact are still more uncertain. Thus in Hom. xi. 35, xix. 2, the duration of the temptation of Jesus is

<sup>1</sup> As the Ebionites wore but one garment, *μαφόριον* (turban) had to be substituted for *χιτών* Credner, Contributions, i 308.

said to be forty days, as in Luke iv. 2; while in Matthew, iv. 2, the temptation is transferred to the end of the forty days' fast. But this statement may also have been in an extra-canonical Gospel. In Hom. xv. 10, the words, ὁ κύριος πιστοὺς πένητας ἴμακάριστε, are thought to refer to Luke vi. 20;<sup>1</sup> but as in the passage in the Homilies the whole emphasis lies on the word πιστοὺς, which is wanting in Luke, the quotation must have come from somewhere else, either from Matt. v. 3, where the addition of τῷ πνεύματι corresponds in meaning with πιστοὺς, or more probably from an apocryphal Gospel. In Hom. xviii. 16 we read: τῷ γὰρ ἀξίῳ τοῦ γνῶναι ὁ μὴ οἶδεν ὄφείλεται, τοῦ δὲ μὴ ἀξίου κἄν δοκῇ ἔχειν ἀφαιρεῖται, κἄν ἐν ἄλλοις ἥ σοφός. That the saying of Jesus, Matt. xiii. 12; Mark iv. 25; Luke viii. 18, floated before the author's mind cannot be doubted; but that he had exactly the reading of Luke in his eye is not likely, as he touches it only in one trivial deviation from Matthew, i. e. δοκεῖ ἔχειν instead of ἔχει. No more results from Hom. iii. 18: τῷ λέγειν ἐπὶ τῆς καθέδρας Μωάσέως ἐκάθησαν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι· πάντα ὅσα λέγωσιν ὑμῖν ἀκούετε αὐτῶν. αὐτῶν δὲ, εἰπεν, ὡς τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς βασιλείας πεπιστευμένων, γῆτις ἐστὶν γνῶσις, ἡ μόνη τὴν πύλην τῆς ζωῆς ἀνοίξαι δύναται, δὶς ἡς μόνης εἰς τὴν αἰωνίαν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν ἔστιν· ἀλλὰ ναί, φησιν, κρατοῦσι μὲν τὴν κλεῖν, τοῦ δὲ βουλομένοις εἰσελθεῖν οὐ παρέχουσιν. Comp. Hom. xviii. 16: ἐπειδὴ ἀπέκρυψον τὴν γνῶσιν τῆς βασιλείας, καὶ οὕτε αὐτοὶ εἰσῆλθον οὕτε τοῖς βουλομένοις εἰσελθεῖν παρέσχον. These passages unmistakably recall Luke xi. 52: οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς νομικοῖς, ὅτι γῆρατε τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσήλθετε καὶ τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἐκωλύσατε. Yet the author does not appear to have had our recension of this saying, for he not only alters νομικοὶ into γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, and αἴρειν into κρατεῖν, but in the concluding words, with similar tautology, he says βουλομένοις εἰσελθεῖν instead of εἰσερχομένους, and οὐ παρέχειν instead of κωλύειν; and in the same manner κλεῖς

<sup>1</sup> Franckh, in the treatise which has been used in addition to that of Hilgenfeld in this summary, "The Gospel Quotations in the Clementine Homilies." Studien d. ev. Geistl. Wurtemb. 1847 (xix.), 2, 170 ff.

ορ γνώσις τῆς βασιλείας. These deviations from our text, repeated in distant places, allow us to infer with comparative certainty the existence of a tradition which gave the words of Jesus in this form; and that it is not to be looked for in a mere variation of Luke is probable not only in itself, but also on account of the parallel passages in Matt. xxiii. 14, and in Justin, Tr. 17, which, more nearly approaching the Clementine text, prove that the saying was current in more than one form. Of the passage in Hom. xvii. 5: μὴ φοβηθῆτε ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀποκτείνοντος το σῶμα, τῇ δὲ ψυχῇ μὴ δυναμένου τι ποιήσαι φοβήθητε τὸν δυνάμενον καὶ σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρὸς βαλεῖν· ναὶ λέγω ὑμῖν, τοῦτον φοβήθητε, it has already been remarked, relatively to the kindred Justinian quotation, that the accordance of the citation by Justin and by the pretended Clement of Rome point to an extra-canonical source. The words of Peter in Hom. iii. 60 have incomparably more resemblance to Matt. xxiv. 45 than to Luke xii. 42; only at the commencement the phrase, μακάριος ὁ δούλος ἔκεινος, ὃν καταστήσει ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ θεραπείας τῶν συνδούλων αὐτοῦ, which is repeated in c. 64, reminds us of Luke, inasmuch as Luke has καταστήσει and Matthew κατέστησεν; but as it also materially differs from Luke, and as this variation reappears unchanged, we must rather presuppose an extra-canonical text-form, and it is only by such that we can account for the concluding words of the quotation, διχοτομήσει αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ ἀπιστοῦν αὐτοῦ μέρος μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν θήσει, with its peculiar interpretation of διχοτομεῖν. If Hom. viii. 4 (*πολλοὶ ἐλεύσονται ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν, ἄρκτον τε καὶ μετημβρίας*), like Luke xiii. 29 (*ἥξουσιν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν καὶ βορρᾶ καὶ νότου*), adds the north and the south to the east and west, which are alone mentioned in Matt. viii. 11, such amplification is too natural to be taken into consideration when combined with a different form of words, which is probably indicative of a peculiar text. Of the answer to the rich young man (Hom. iii. 57; xvii. 4; xviii. 1, 3), it has already been observed that it is not to be explained by our synoptical texts. The same applies to Hom. xii. 29: τὰ ἀγαθὰ

ἀλθεῖν δεῖ, μακάριος δέ, φησι, δὶ οὐ ἔρχεται· ὅμοίως καὶ τὰ κακὰ ἀνάγκη ἀλθεῖν, οὐαὶ δὲ δὶ οὐ ἔρχεται, compared with Matt. xviii. 7; Luke xvii. 1. Hom. xvii. 16, ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν νεκρῶν, ὅταν τραπέντες εἰς φῶς τὰ σώματα ἵσταγγελοι γένωνται, τότε ἴδειν δυνήσονται (τὸν πατέρα), has only the word ἵσταγγελος in common with Luke xx. 36, from which of course nothing can be proved. Finally, if the allusion to the visit of Christ to Zaccheus in Hom. iii. 83 can, among our Evangelists, be referred only to Luke xix. 1 ff., we have no sort of evidence that this incident was unknown to extraneous evangelical tradition. Therefore, neither can this feature prove anything.

Summing up everything, the result is that, although the author of the Homilies knew and employed our third Gospel, it was not to him, any more than to Justin, a chief source of his knowledge of Gospel history. For among the large number of his Gospel quotations, comparatively few can be traced with certainty or even with probability to our Luke. The Gospel which he used by preference seems, besides our Matthew, to have been an extra-canonical writing, identical in the main with Justin's apocryphal Memorabilia.

That our author was acquainted with the Acts can as little be conjectured from the catalogue of names, Hom. ii 1, as from the passage in Hom. iii 53, ἐγὼ εἴμι περὶ οὐ Μωυσῆς προεφήτευσεν εἰπών· προφήτην ἐγερεῖ ὑμῖν κύριος, &c.; for the few names in that list which appear in the Acts also were surely not unknown in general tradition; and though the passage in Deut. xviii. 15 may be quoted nowhere in the New Testament except in Acts iii. 22, vii. 37, it was doubtless very familiar to Christian apologetics. As the quotation differs moreover from that of Luke in words, and as no mention is made in the Acts of a saying by Christ, we have the less cause for accepting the improbable hypothesis that a book glorifying Paul after the manner of the Acts should be employed by an opponent so vehement as the author of the Homilies. But for this very reason it cannot be decided whether it was known to him at all.

The Gospel quotations of the Clementine Recognitions are only transmitted to us by the unreliable hand of their translator, Rufinus, who undoubtedly adapted them to our Gospels even when they originally deviated from them. We are therefore not justified, as Hilgenfeld has also observed (p. 370), in inferring the actual use of our Gospels from their accordance with most of the quotations; but the contrary deduction alone is tenable, that in those instances in which the Recognitions deviate considerably from the canonical text, either in common with the Homilies or independently, an uncanonical Gospel was used either by the author or by his authorities. We might therefore entirely pass over this writing, were there not some features which seem to point partly to our Gospel of Luke and partly to the Acts, and which cannot have originated with the author. Besides the passage vi. 5 (*ipse magister . . . orabat patrem pro infectoribus suis et dicebat: pater remitte eis peccatum, nesciunt enim quid faciunt*), where the quotation from Luke is quite as probable as in the corresponding passage in Hom. vi. 20, which is also recalled by the addition of *peccatum*, several other traits in the first book must be mentioned. When it is narrated of Barnabas (i. 10) that he hastened his departure from Rome, dicens, *se diem festum religionis suæ, qui immineret, omnimodis apud Judæum celebraturum*, these words strikingly remind us of Acts xviii. 21: *εἰπών· δεῖ με πάντως τὴν ἑορτὴν τὴν ἐρχομένην ποιῆσαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα*; and this affinity is the more striking if we compare the parallel passage, Hom. i. 13, where the saying, much further removed from the Acts, runs thus: *σπεύδειν ἔλεγεν εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν τῆς κατὰ τὴν θρησκείαν ἑορτῆς χάριν*. It really looks quite as if the reading in the Recognitions had been formed on the recollection of the passage in the Acts, but it is nevertheless possible that this decided resemblance to the speech of Paul was first given to it by the translator. More certain is the use of our Luke in Recog. i. 40: *Nos ergo primos elegit duodecim sibi credentes, quos apostolos nominavit, postmodum alios septuaginta duos probatissimos disci-*

pulos, ut vel hoc modo recognita imagine Moysis crederet multitudine. Although the number of the disciples chosen later is here fixed as seventy-two instead of seventy, and the precedent of Moses is given as the ground of their selection, after all that has been said above (p. 41) we cannot suppose that we here have the most ancient form of the history of the seventy disciples, and that this feature, originally belonging to the Jewish Christian tradition, was altered by Luke and applied in favour of his universalism; but that the author of the Recognitions had the narrative of Luke before his eyes; while instead of its original motive he substituted another in itself very improbable, and, to render the resemblance with Moses more perfect, the number seventy (if indeed this really existed originally in our Gospel)<sup>1</sup> may have been changed to seventy-two, the author having followed the interpretation of Numb. xi., which reckons the two named in verse 26 with those before mentioned.<sup>2</sup> The same paragraph of the Recognitions has also respect to passages in the Acts. Above all others, we must notice the mention of Gamaliel in i. 65. Gamaliel, the princeps populi, qui latenter frater noster erat in fide, sed consilio nostro inter eos (the priests) erat, here silences the people by a speech which begins: Quiescite paullisper o viri Israelitae, non enim advertitis tentationem, quæ imminet vobis, propter quod desinite ab hominibus istis, et si quidem humani consilii est, quod agunt, cito cessabit, si autem a Deo est, cur sine causa peccatis, nec proficitis quidquam? That these are for the most part the same words which the Acts, v. 35, 38, put into the mouth of Gamaliel, and that Gamaliel appears in a quite similar part here as there, is evident; but it is also equally clear that the representation in the Acts served as a model for the Recognitions, and not vice versa. For,

<sup>1</sup> For in Luke x. 1, 17, ἐβδομήκοντα δύο has such good evidence that it is a question which is the correct reading

<sup>2</sup> Thus he also reckons (i. 34) seventy-two descendants of the twelve sons of Jacob, whereas our Hebrew text, Gen. i. 27, gives only seventy, the Septuagint seventy-five. The Jewish reckoning of the nations of the world also varies, as is well known, between seventy and seventy-two.

in the first place, in the secret Christianity of Gamaliel it is impossible to mistake the childish exaggeration of the obviously unhistorical trait adduced in the Acts; and secondly, we shall further on be convinced that it was in all probability the author of the Acts himself who first introduced Gamaliel into the narrative contained in his fifth chapter. In this case therefore the employment of the Acts by the Recognitions can scarcely be doubted. Further evidence of this is given in i. 71, when it is said of the inimicus homo (Paul): *quod legationem suscepisset a Caipha pontifice, ut omnes, qui crederent in Jesum, persequerentur (etur) et Damascum pergeret cum epistolis ejus, &c.* As may be seen, a tolerably exact parallel to Acts ix. 1,<sup>1</sup> in which however the priority of the Acts is raised beyond all doubt, as the Recognitions connect Paul's persecution of the Christians with the prodigious story of the disputation of the Apostles in the Temple; and, instead of Stephen, record the ill usage of James, and that by Paul in person (ch. lxx.). When in the same 71st chapter the number of Christians who fled from Jerusalem to Jericho is given as 5000 men, it is natural to presume that this number also was borrowed from the Acts, where it is written in iv. 4, *καὶ ἐγενήθη ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ὥστε χιλιάδες πέντε,* and then later, viii. 1, *πάντες τε διεσπάροσαν . . . πλὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων,* the last being certainly denied in the Recognitions, which treat tradition in general in a very free manner. One other feature I am also inclined to attribute to the Acts, although it appears incongruous with its views, i.e. the strange assertion in Recog. i. 60: Barnabas, qui et Matthias, qui in locum Judæ subrogatus est apostolus. That this is not merely a fiction, but one destitute of all tradition, need scarcely be remarked; a man so conspicuous as Barnabas could not even in fable be identified with Matthias. But what can have caused the fiction? Chiefly, beyond a doubt, the desire to honour Barnabas, one of its chief heroes, by an admission to the Apostolic College, and perhaps

<sup>1</sup> Ο δὲ Σαῦλος . . . προσελθὼν ἀρχιερεῖ ἡγίσατο παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐπιστολὰς εἰς Δαμασκὸν, &c.

still more the object of depriving the extension of the apostolic office to Paul of the support which it might have derived by analogy with Barnabas, on whom the title of Apostle was likewise conferred by ecclesiastical usage, although he also did not belong to the twelve (Acts xiv. 4, 14; 1 Cor. ix. 6); and as there was no other means of doing this, except by giving the place of Judas to Barnabas, and seeing also that Matthias was acknowledged to be the successor of Judas, nothing was left but to declare Barnabas and Matthias to be the same individual. It is true the history of the completion of the apostolic number by Matthias may have been current independently of the Acts. But when we read in the latter that (i. 23) lots were cast on this occasion between Barsabas and Matthias, it is quite conceivable that this very juxtaposition of these two names suggested the alteration to the author of the Recognitions, with whom the Acts was by no means a binding authority. But if this appears too far-fetched, the other passages which I have adduced will abundantly prove that the Acts, as well as the third Gospel, are taken into consideration by the first book of the Recognitions.

Now if Hilgenfeld's<sup>1</sup> view were undoubtedly established, according to which ch. 27—72 of this book was taken substantially unchanged from the *Κήρυγμα Πέτρου*, a work of the first century, the data given above would contain evidence of such high antiquity for the writings of Luke as can be claimed by no other book in the New Testament,<sup>2</sup> and we could scarcely avoid attributing the composition of these writings to a period at least very near the apostolic age; or if this should be prohibited on other historical grounds, we should be finally obliged to abandon the reference of the Recognitions to our Gospel of Luke and our Acts, and to trace their points of contact from common authorities. The history of the seventy disciples, and the prayer of Jesus in behalf of his enemies, must then be referred to the Gospel of Peter, and the data in which the Recognitions harmo-

<sup>1</sup> The Clementine Homilies and Recognitions, p. 26.

<sup>2</sup> Irrespective of the mutual references of the books of the New Testament.

nize with the Acts to the Κήρυγμα Πέτρου. Meanwhile, this theory as to the origin of the Recognitions is by no means established; and even if sundry portions of pseudo-Clementine literature are actually incorporated in this writing, we could not make use of Hilgenfeld's acute discovery in the question before us, until it had been more clearly defined how far the substance had remained unsullied in the elaboration, or had been replaced by other elements. This point does not seem to me in any way decided by the preceding investigation; and the data alluded to above are not the only ones which leave me in doubt whether the derivation of the section of the Recognitions from ch. 27—72 comes unmixed from the preaching of Peter. Only this is not the place in which to pursue the subject. In the present investigation, Ritschl's<sup>1</sup> assumption would be less objectionable, in which the Κήρυγμα Πέτρου is supposed to be directed against Basilides, and its revision in the first three books of the Recognitions against Valentinus, for on this supposition the Κήρυγμα would be attributed to the interval between A.D. 120—140, and the revision in the Recognitions to 140—160, and at this period we have distinct traces of the existence of the third Gospel. But on this assumption also it is questionable how far the last reviser of the Recognitions, writing scarcely sooner than the beginning of the third century, has preserved those sections unaltered which he received from earlier works. Under such circumstances, I should not wish to found any conclusion on the points of contact between this work and the Gospel of Luke and the Acts, which might lead us beyond what is otherwise known and susceptible of proof.

##### 5. THE YOUNGER GNOSTICS, CELSUS, THEOPHILUS, TATIAN.

With the Epistle of Polycarp we have already come down to a period at which the existence and recognition of our canonical Gospels can no longer be questioned. Thus we now find our

<sup>1</sup> Origin of the Ancient Catholic Church, 184—175.

Luke not only among the Gnostic, but even among the Gentile opponents of Christianity, while at the same time the Catholic teachers of the Church begin to speak of it more decidedly. Among the Gnostics one might certainly be inclined to credit a much earlier circulation of the Gospel of Luke, even independently of Marcion. The author of the pseudo-Philosophumena of Origen (vi. 16, Schl.) found in a writing which he attributes to Simon Magus the saying which is similarly recorded in Matt. iii. 10; Luke iii. 9; and if modern scholars have rightly understood him, he also found in Basilides<sup>1</sup> and Valentinus<sup>2</sup> Gnostic interpretations of Luke i. 35. But I have elsewhere demonstrated that we have no right to attribute the writings from which the two last quotations are derived to Basilides and Valentinus themselves, and not much more to the younger members of their school; and that they are not ascribed to those schismatics by the author of the so-called Philosophumena<sup>3</sup>. This certainly

<sup>1</sup> vii. 26 · τοῦτο ἐστὶ, φησὶ, τὸ εἰρημένον, πνεῦμα ἄγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σὲ . . . καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι.

<sup>2</sup> vi. 35 · πνεῦμα ἄγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σὲ . . . πνεῦμά ἐστιν ἡ σοφία. . . . Καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι· ὑψιστός ἐστιν ὁ δημιουργός. Comp. c. 51 with Luke i. 26, 35.

<sup>3</sup> Tübingen Journal, 1853, p. 148. What Jacobi (in the German Zeitschr. f. Christl. Wissensch. 1853, p. 198) opposes to this is scarcely adapted to upset the result. Jacobi must admit my chief argument, that the false Origen himself does not impute to Basilides or Valentinus the works from which his extracts are derived, and what then can be the use of appealing to the fact that they nevertheless present the authentic doctrine of Valentine and Basilides? Granting that it really is as Jacobi supposes, which the incompleteness and partial discordance of the other witnesses makes it difficult to prove, and which this is not the place to investigate, does it follow that these writings were composed by Basilides and Valentinus, or that at least all the sayings quoted therein were used by these schismatics themselves? Just as well might it be asserted that no Lutheran dogmatist could have a quotation which had not been first made by Luther. It is therefore quite impossible to prove that the author of the Philosophumena records the Gospel quotations of Basilides and Valentinus, and nothing can be more illogical than Jacobi's conclusion that because "he expresses the intention of giving the *opinions* of Basilides, we have good reason for assuming the source of his references to be a writing of Basilides." I must insist on this, that we cannot even be assured that the author himself considered the writings which he employed to be the works of Basilides and Valentinus, and I cannot comprehend how it is possible at the same moment to vaunt the authenticity of his representation and the accuracy of his literary knowledge, and to speak of his mistake respecting the pseudo-Simonian Apophysis, the palpable forgery of which he did not suspect. If

occurs with respect to the writing of Simon; but in this very instance the subject-matter, as we shall presently demonstrate, puts it beyond doubt that we are dealing with a forger belonging at least to a younger generation of Gnostics. The quotations therefore scarcely lead us further than the preceding ones from an Ophite writing of which the reference to our Luke is, after all, but doubtful.<sup>1</sup> It shows that our Gospel was used by the followers of Basilides and Valentinus, but how far this use extended we cannot at all decide on such premises.

\* It is only of the later Valentinian school that we are assured by Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria that they sedulously employed our third, like the remaining Gospels, as the basis of their opinions. Among the New Testament proof passages of the Valentinians, cited by Irenæus in his first book, a fair number are derived from the third Gospel. Thus we learn from c. iii. 2, that they find the third series of their æons, the Dodekas, indicated in the story in Luke (ii. 42) of Jesus when twelve years of age. The passage in Luke ii. 23 they referred (c. iii. 4; Epiph. H. xxxi. 14) to the Soter, ὃς το πᾶν ὡν διήνοιξε τὴν μήτραν τῆς Ἐνθυμήσεως; the saying in Luke xiv. 27 (iii. 5) to the æon Stauros; Luke iii. 17 (Matt. iii. 12) to the same as Horos; the

I am encountered by the observation that the Basilidian writing cited by our Heresiarch must be the work of Basilides himself, as we know of no disciple of his who can have composed it, in the place of an answer the question presents itself, How many of the disciples of Basilides do we know at all besides his son Isidore? and if the acquaintance of Valentinus with the fourth Gospel is deduced from his acquaintance with the doctrine of the Logos, it may be rejoined that if all symptoms are not deceptive, the doctrine of the Logos was not originally introduced into the Church by the fourth Gospel. On the other hand, I am very grateful to Jacobi for the observation which essentially aids in corroborating my opinion, that in several passages from the supposed writing of Basilides, sayings from the New Testament are quoted with the expressions (*γραφή*, &c.) which do not appear with reference to the *New Testament* till some time after the middle of the second century.

<sup>1</sup> In the extracts from such writing, v. 7, p. 100, 87 perhaps alludes to Luke xvii. 21; comp. xii. 31; more distinctly p. 103, 40 to Luke xi. 33 or Matt. v. 15; whereas p. 102, 26, *τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν*, &c., does not seem to be derived from the reading of Luke, but to the more ancient form of the answer to the rich young man (see above); when in line 16 the Oxford editor inappropriately refers to Luke xvii. 4, the mere expression *γραφή*) might have shown him that it related to a passage in the Old Testament (Prov. xxiv. 16).

twelve-year-old daughter of Jairus (Luke viii. 14) was supposed to be a type of Achamoth (viii. 2); in the speeches in Luke ix. 57 and 61, &c. and xix. 5, they found expressed the antithesis of the hylic, the psychic, and the pneumatic natures (c. viii. 3, Epiph. elsewhere, 25); Luke xv. 4 they interpreted of the lower, Luke xv. 8 of the higher Sophia; to the latter also was referred the saying in Luke vii. 35 (Matt xi. 19), and it was prefigured by Anna the Prophetess (Luke ii. 36): whereas the words of Simeon (Luke ii. 28), when recognizing Christ, are attributed to the Demiurge. A Valentinian interpretation of Luke xiv. 27 is mentioned in Epiph. H: xxxi. 14. Similar explanations of Scripture are reported in Irenæus i. 20 and Epiphanius H. xxxiv. 18, especially by one of the Valentinian sects, the Marcosians. The saying of Jesus in Luke ii. 49 is here employed to prove that Jesus proclaimed an unknown God; in Luke xix. 42 they discovered in the ἐκρύβη an indication of the hidden first cause, the Bythos; the saying in Luke xii. 50 they referred (c. xxi. 2) to the spiritual baptism which they required. Clement Al. Strom. iv. 502, and Origen in Jo. Tr. 14, cite interpretations by the Valentinian Heracleon of the passages, Luke xii. 8; xix. 10. To the Valentinian school we must also finally attribute the quotations in the *Excerpta ex scriptis Theodoti*, which are found among the works of the Alexandrian Clement.<sup>1</sup> Compare with c. i. 62, Luke xxiii. 46; with c. ix., Luke xv. 23; with c. xiv., Schl. Luke xvi. 24; with c. xvi., Luke iii. 22; with c. lx, Luke i. 35; with c. lxi., Luke ii. 40, 52, ix. 22; with c. lxxxiii., Schl. Luke ii. 14; with c. lxxxvi., Luke x. 19.

In these quotations, moreover, the comparatively large number of deviations from our text deserves attention, as by their partial

<sup>1</sup> This is clear not only from the contents of the excerpta, but also from the title, false as is the chronological statement: ἐκ τῶν Θεοδότου καὶ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς καλούμενης διδασκαλίας κατά τοὺς Οὐαλεντίνου χρόνους ἐπιτομαί. It was thus, according to Origen, Philosoph. vi. 35, among the later Valentinians that the contrast of the ἀνατολικὴ and ἑταλιωτικὴ διδασκαλία was formed. The false Origen reckons Heracleon and Ptolemaus as of the Italian school, a certain Axionicus and Ardesianes as of the Oriental school—the latter, probably, a corrupted Bardesanes.

accordance with other traces of extra-canonical Gospels they indicate the form of Gospel literature antecedent to that of our times. Whether the Carpocratians also made use of our Luke cannot be positively ascertained from Irenæus i. 25; Epiph. Hár. xxvii. 5, as it is doubtful whether we have here a confusion of readings from Matt. v. 25 and Luke xii. 58, or an original text. Of the employment of the Acts by the Gnostics above mentioned I have found no trace.

That Celsus was acquainted with our Luke, one passage only testifies with certainty. It is true, in Orig. c. Cels. ii. 27, he makes the reproach against Christians: *μεταχαράττειν ἐκ τῆς πρώτης γραφῆς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τριχῆ καὶ τετραχῆ καὶ πολλαχῆ*, but this is far too vague to be referred positively to our four canonical Gospels. A special reference to Luke might be found elsewhere, i. 70, when Origen retorts on Celsus: *ἀλλ’ ἔστω, λεγέτω αὐτὸν βεβρωκέναι μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν τὸ Πάσχα οὐ μόνον εἰπόντα τό· ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ Πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ’ ὑμῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ βεβρωκότα.* But that Celsus really said this does not follow from the sentence; on the contrary, it is evident from the passage immediately preceding that only the general assertion, *οὐδὲ τοιαῦτα σιτεῖται σῶμα θεοῦ*, belongs to Celsus, while the Gospel testimony is added by Origen. Nothing more is proved by the sayings of Celsus, v. 52: *καὶ μὴν καὶ πρὸς αὐτοῦ τοῦδε τάφον ἐλθεῖν ἄγγελον οἵ μέν ἔνα, οἱ δέ δύο τοὺς ἀποκρινομένους ταῖς γυναιξὶν ὅτι ἀνέστη;* and ii. 55: *ἢ οἰεσθε . . . ὑμῖν . . . τὴν καταστροφὴν τοῦ δράματος εὐσχημόνως ἐφευρῆσθαι . . . ὅτι . . . νεκρὸς . . . ἀνέστη καὶ τὰ σημεῖα τῆς κολάστεως ἔδειξε, καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ὡς ἡσαν πεπερονημέναι.* Both statements, that *two* angels appeared at the tomb of Jesus, and that after the resurrection Jesus showed the prints of the nails in his hands, are given, among our Evangelists, by Luke alone, xxiv. 4, 39, and John xx. 12, 27. But similar statements may have existed in other Gospels, and it is also a question whether Celsus had both our Evangelists before his eyes, or only one of the two, and which. On the other hand, the continuation of Luke's genealogy up to Adam is so closely connected with the

dogmatic tendency of the Evangelist, that it is very likely to have originated with him.<sup>1</sup> But to this Celsus especially refers, Orig. ii. 32, in the words, ἀπηνθαδῆσθαι τὸν γενεαλογήσαντας ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου φύντος καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἰουδαίοις βασιλέων τὸν Ἰησοῦν. The passage therefore proves that in all probability our third Gospel was not unknown to this opponent of Christianity.

Almost contemporaneously with Celsus, namely, about 170—180 A.D.,<sup>2</sup> seems to have flourished the first ecclesiastical author in whom, according to Justin, we find a positive quotation from the third Gospel, i. e. Theophilus. The words, ad Autol. ii. 13, τὰ γὰρ παρὰ αὐθέρωποις ἀδύνατα, δυνατά ἔστι παρὰ θεῷ, undoubtedly contain a reminiscence of Luke xviii. 27: τα ἀδύνατα παρὰ ἀνθρώποις δυνατά ἔστι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ (in Matt. xix. 26; Mark x. 27, the saying is verbally different). At the same period Tatian is supposed to have used it in his Diatessaron. But as we are still not quite clear about the constitution of this work,<sup>3</sup> we cannot attribute any decisive value to the statement if it were not supported by the extension of the Gospel at that time as proved by other testimony. Two passages from the third Gospel and the Acts are quoted in the writings of the Churches at Vienne and Lyons, A.D. 177 (Eus. v. i. 9; ii. 5). On the whole, however, the Gnostics of that time at least seem to have made more diligent use of the Gospel than the Fathers of the Catholic Church.

## 6. IRENÆUS AND LATER AUTHORS. RETROSPECT.

All the evidence which we have hitherto examined refers only to the existence and employment of the writings of Luke at certain periods; of their origin we learn nothing more definite from any of these ancient witnesses; only Justin says expressly that he reckons the Gospel among the works of the Apostles and

<sup>1</sup> Tübingen Journal, ii. 73. Baur, Critical Researches, p. 504.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Tübingen Journal, iv. 628.

<sup>3</sup> The contradictory assertions of the ancients, see in *De Wette*, Int. to the New Testament, § 68. *Credner's Contributions*, i. 437.

the Apostles' disciples, and Tr. 103 seems to indicate that it is the work of the disciple of an Apostle. It is in Irenæus that we first find both writings of Luke not only freely employed, but ascribed by name to Luke as their author. What he imparts to us on this subject is as follows: Luke was a disciple and follower of the Apostles (iii. 10, 1), and especially the inseparable companion and assistant of Paul, as is shown by the well-known passages in the Acts and the Pauline Epistles (Col. iv. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 9; iii. 14, 1). After the death of the Apostle, he wrote down the Gospel as it had been preached by Paul and by himself with him; in the Acts he narrated, among others, the occurrences at which he was personally present (iii. 1, 1; xiv. 1). It is obvious that, besides the natural presumption as to the date of the composition of the Gospel, nothing is here told us which could not have been gathered from the New Testament itself, if it is once admitted that the third Gospel and the Acts are written by Luke, the companion of Paul; for that such a one only was able to transmit the Pauline Gospel was a matter of course in the opinion of the ancient Church. It is therefore a question whether more than this simple notice was delivered to Irenæus by tradition; but even if such were the case, we should still have every reason for supposing that these further particulars rested on mere conjecture. The date of the composition of the Gospel was usually transferred at a later period to a still more remote period of the apostolic age. Clement of Alexandria (in Eus. H. E. vi. 145) supposes it to have been written, not, like Irenæus, contemporaneously with Mark, but previously; it is true, merely on the internal ground that Mark would likewise have given the genealogy if it had not been already produced in Matthew and Luke. Origen certainly (in Eus. vi. 256), appealing to tradition, declares it to be later than Mark, but he assumes it to have been written during the lifetime of Paul, and to have been expressly recognized by him. Eusebius himself, iii. 4, 7, observes that this recognition is to be found in the expression, *κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου* (Rom. ii. 16; 2 Tim. ii. 8). Whether Tertullian believed it

to have been written during the lifetime or after the death of Paul cannot be discovered; but he pronounces very decidedly (c. Marc. iv. 2, 5) that it contained the genuine Pauline Gospel. What is said<sup>1</sup> of the works of Luke by later writers, such as Jerome, Chrysostom; Theophylact, does not lead us essentially beyond the more ancient statements, and rests so palpably on mere conjecture that we have no occasion to dwell upon it. The authenticity of both writings is from the time of Irenæus universally acknowledged; and only with regard to the Acts is the single statement of Photius to be found, that by some it was considered to be the work of Barnabas or of the Ronian Clement.

If we sum up the whole, the result is, that by means of external evidence the existence of the third Gospel can be proved from the time of Marcion and Justin, that of the Acts only from about the year 170. The first who indicates Luke as the author of these writings is Irenæus, in his work written towards the end of the second century, but Justin seems already to ascribe the Gospel to the disciple of an Apostle. The further statements concerning the person of Luke and the origin of his writings, which we find among the Fathers of the Church after Irenæus, appear one and all to rest on conclusions for which the writings themselves, and the scanty indications of spurious Pauline Epistles, offered the only support. We possess no real tradition of either the date of the composition of the Lukian writings or of the place and the circumstantial details of their origin. With the process and extent of their circulation we are only imperfectly acquainted until the time of Irenæus. We find the Gospel at Rome in the hands of Justin, although it does not seem to have been one of the original sources of his knowledge of the evangelical history; whether Marcion made acquaintance with it sooner or later, in Rome or in Asia Minor, we cannot decide; that any other of the older Gnostics made use of it, is

<sup>1</sup> See Credner, Int. to the New Testament, i. 147. De Wette, Int. to the New Testament, 5th ed. pp. 190, 234.

not possible to prove. In the interval between Justin and Irenæus, the Gospel is comparatively seldom, the Acts only twice, quoted in ecclesiastical writings; whereas the younger Gnostics after 160—180 made great use of the Gospel. Celsus was acquainted with it, and even somewhat earlier the author of the Clementine Homilies used it in the same manner as Justin, for the completion of that which was presented in other writings more freely employed; the Recognitions, finally, refer more than once to the narratives of both books, but it cannot be proved that this reference was made by any but the last reviser of the work (about 200 A.D.).

If we inquire how far these witnesses guarantee the authenticity and credibility of the writings of Luke and of the Acts in particular, it is plainly obvious that they are quite insufficient. Granting even that it was proved (which by external evidence it cannot be) that Marcion and Justin were assured of the Lukan origin of the third Gospel, and that the Acts were likewise already in circulation under the name of Luke, the authenticity and age of these writings would even then be far from certain; and from the use made of the third Gospel by Marcion and Justin, to argue its "universal acceptance" after the year 120 is a hasty step, such as undeniably occurs often enough in the customary ignorance of the conditions of strict historical research. What really results from the witnesses is merely this: that the Gospel was in use about the year 140, or at the earliest about 130, in the circles frequented by Marcion and Justin; but whether we are to look for these circles elsewhere than at Rome, and whether the Gospel was used beyond them and at any earlier period, and how far this use extended,—of all this, as far as we have yet arrived, we know nothing whatever. Such gaps in our knowledge are usually filled up by the assumption that a writing in use in one or two places enjoyed the same recognition throughout the Church, that a Father such as Justin would not have used a Gospel the authenticity of which he had not ascertained after an unimpeachable method. But

how have we gained a right to make assumptions of this kind ? Whoever has contemplated the writings of that age with any degree of candour, must be aware that even the most distinguished of the ancient teachers of the Church were, practically, entirely wanting not only in the art, but in the conception, of historical criticism, and that the acceptation or rejection of an ecclesiastical document, so far as we are able to form an opinion, was never decided on historical but always on dogmatical grounds, for the sake of theological, religious and ecclesiastical interests.<sup>1</sup> Just as historical research did not guide Marcion in his revision of our Luke, no more did it determine his acceptance of it ; but he took this Gospel as a basis, because, among those extant at that period, it afforded the least difficulties and the strongest points of support for his own system, and perhaps also because it bore the name of a Paulinist in its front. Neither did the Catholic Fathers proceed in any other way; and, judging by all that we otherwise know of him, it is more than improbable that Justin should have made an exception to this custom. Of the next chief witness, the author of the Clementine Homilies, no one can well expect him to have examined the writings which he employed with the eye of an historical critic. If, finally, a more general use of the third Gospel is gradually shown about the year 170, this period is already so remote from the first demonstrable appearance of the document, that it cannot afford any grounds for conclusions regarding its origin. In this respect great value has been attached to the use of the ecclesiastical Gospels by the Gnostics. These heretics, it is said, would not have employed writings so adverse to their own opinions had they not been compelled to do so by the voice of the Church, by the force of a general and firmly established tradition. But the Gnostics had in general no desire to part from the Church and ecclesiastical tradition ; what they wished was to be the true disciples of Christ, and with that object they were obliged to

<sup>1</sup> Compare *Schwegler*, Post-Ap. Age, i. 45 ff., 74 ff. *Baur*, The Critic and Fanatic, p. 64 ff.; and my observations, *Tübingen Journal*, iv. 640 ; vi. 145.

spare no pains to prove as far as possible their accordance with the doctrine of Christ. For this, however, writings belonging to a higher stage of development, such as the Gospels of Luke and of John, offered incomparably more points of support than those more nearly related to their chief antagonist, Jewish Christianity. It was therefore in the nature of the thing, and is no evidence of the undoubted acceptance of these writings by the Church, but only of their greater affinity with the Gnostic mode of thought, if at the time of Irenæus we find Luke as well as John more zealously used and expounded by the Gnostics than by the Catholic teachers of the Church. So far as difficulties presented themselves, the means of overcoming them had long been discovered. There was no need for rejecting books which, according to their true meaning, in many ways opposed the Gnostic dogma; it was not even necessary to garble them like Marcion; four centuries before, the Grecian allegorists, and again two centuries before, the Alexandrine Jews, had shown the way to smooth over contradictions such as these. It is well known to what a large extent the Valentinians especially employed this expedient of allegorical exegesis; and what could therefore restrain them from the acceptance of writings which after all it was not easy to dispense with? Hence external evidence does not exclude the possibility of the spuriousness and relatively late origin even of the Gospel. Naturally, much less of the Acts, of which we find the first certain trace about the year 170; for whether it is by the same author as the Gospel has in every case still to be investigated. Its authenticity even then remains as doubtful as that of the Gospel, and for the date of its composition we might, should internal marks require it, descend several years or possibly even decades. Finally, as regards the credibility of their narratives, the witnesses we have examined leave us in total darkness. For if it is very difficult, even in the case of a writer whose person and circumstances we know, to judge of his trustworthiness otherwise than by his writings; it becomes a complete impossibility with one of whose person, time and circumstances,

we know next to nothing; we may be inclined to believe the best with respect to his love of truth and his competence as an author; but to become more than a prejudice or a provisional impression, this favourable opinion must be verified by a rigorous criticism of details, without which we know neither that the author was able nor that he was willing to tell the truth; we know his historical authorities and resources as little as his own opinions; we are not sure that he even wished to give a strictly historical account, and still less that he understood the requirements of such a representation, or possessed the means of satisfying them. Hence, as we must not enter upon the investigation of the historical contents of our book—the task now before us—with an assumption of its spuriousness and untrustworthiness, neither must we start with the contrary assumption; for the credibility of its narratives cannot either be maintained or denied *a priori*; and the real state of the case will be most decisively shown by the nature of these narratives themselves.

## Second Part.

### THE HISTORICAL SUBJECT-MATTER OF THE ACTS.

---

WE can distinguish a three-fold element in the narratives of the Acts. The first five chapters, as well as the twelfth, deal exclusively with the original Apostles and the community at Jerusalem. In the division, ch. vi.—xi., with the exception of the episode about Paul, ix. 1—30, the two Hellenists, Stephen and Philip, appear as actors side by side with the Apostles of Palestine; the scene is extended to the whole of Palestine including Samaria, and the occurrences preparatory to the spread of Christianity among the heathen form its main topic. A third group of narratives, ch. ix. 1—30, and all the rest of the work from chapter xiii. inclusive, turns on the person and labours of the Apostle Paul, and considers the primitive community with its Apostles only so far as they come in contact with him. We must now investigate the historical veracity of the records here given us.

---

#### FIRST DIVISION.

##### THE ORIGINAL APOSTLES AND THE CHURCH AT JERUSALEM.

---

###### 1. THE ASCENSION AND THE APOSTOLIC ELECTION.

The Acts of the Apostles is directly connected with the end of the Gospel narrative by the record of the ascension of Christ in ch. i. 1—11. The character of the fact itself may the more

readily be left to the decision of Gospel criticism, the more entirely we are obliged to admit that this has been brought to a conclusion on the point in question by Strauss (*Life of Jesus*, Sect. A. § 141); but for the sake of what follows, the relation of our account with that of the third Gospel (ch. xxiv. 45—53) requires a special elucidation. On the more circumstantial detail of the Acts, the appearance of the angels, &c., we will lay no stress; we will only point out the really incompatible features of the two records. There are, on the whole, four differences between them. (1) As the *place* of the ascension, Bethany is named in the Gospel; here, verse 12, the Mount of Olives. (2) The *time* of the ascension, according to the Acts, falls on the fortieth day after the resurrection; according to the Gospel, on the resurrection-day itself. (3) The words of Jesus are not quite the same in both; and lastly, (4) they appear to be transferred in the Gospel to Jerusalem, in the Acts to the place of the ascension. Of these differences, the first has no importance, for Bethany was situated on the Mount of Olives, and the neighbourhood would be precisely the ὅρος ἐλαιῶνος; the third is likewise not very material, as the passages, Luke xxiv. 47—49 and Acts i. 4, 8, after all coincide in their main purport; and were it not joined to the more vital deviation concerning the time of the ascension, the fourth might be got over by the hypothesis that these words were uttered on the way from Jerusalem to the Mount of Olives, or, yet more simply, by the admission of a slight inaccuracy. The Gospel evidently imagines these words to have been spoken on the very evening of the resurrection-day, as incontrovertibly appears from ch. xxiv. 21, 33, 36, 44 f.;<sup>1</sup> and as by their import as well as by the unanimous assertion of the two records, they are likewise assigned to the period immediately prior to the ascension, it is obvious that according to the Gospel they were spoken on the resurrection-day itself, whereas by the

<sup>1</sup> That there could not be time in one day for all these occurrences (*Lange, Apost. Period*) is perhaps true, but can prove nothing against exegetical evidence, else every other historical improbability would justify the reversal of the records.

Acts they are placed forty days later. To evade this contradiction, the older Harmonists (for example, Bengel, Gnomon on Acts i. 4) denied the identity of the speech of Jesus in the Gospel with that in the Acts; the former was supposed to be uttered on the resurrection-day, the latter forty days later; and it is held by Meyer also that in Acts i. 4 Jesus refers to his earlier promise in Luke xxiv. 49. But this hypothesis is unreliable, if only on account of the distinct reference of Acts i. 4 to the following verse 5. And the relation of the two speeches is also far too close to attribute them to entirely different times and occasions. Moreover the injunction, xxiv. 49, to remain in Jerusalem until the reception of the Holy Ghost, was adapted only to the last meeting of Jesus with his disciples; at an earlier one he would necessarily have referred them to his further personal commands. Finally, if in xxiv. 50 the account of the ascension is to be connected with this very speech and the simple ἔγγιαγε δὲ αὐτοὺς ἔξω, it is evident that the author does not here picture to himself, as in the Acts i. 3, an interval of forty days, with various appearances of the risen Jesus and further discourses. Equally untenable is the hypothesis of Olshausen on Acts i. 6, that only the meeting mentioned in our fourth verse is identical with that of Luke's Gospel, and that verse 6, on the contrary, applies to another and different meeting on the day of the ascension; for in the first place, the Gospel, as we have already observed, represents the conversation of Jesus with the disciples distinctly enough as being the last, and immediately preceding the ascension; Acts i. 6 also refers back to ver. 4 by the *οἱ μὲν οὖν συνελθόντες*, quite as unmistakably as ver. 7 by the question, *κύριε εἰ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ ἀποκαθιστάνεις τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ* (the Apostles believed the establishment of the Messianic kingdom to be near at hand because Jesus had announced the prospect of a speedy fulfilment of the *ἐπαγγελία τοῦ πατρὸς*). Finally, the words which the Gospel puts in the mouth of Jesus in verses 47 ff. are divided in the Acts between verses 4 and 8, which cannot possibly be referred to different

periods. Nothing therefore remains but to acknowledge the suspicious circumstance that the period of the resurrection is designated contradictorily in the two Lukan records.<sup>1</sup> How this phenomenon is to be explained, and what consequences result from it, cannot now be examined; we are here concerned, in the first instance, only with the fact as such.

After the ascension, the Acts further relates, i. 12—26, that the Apostles returned to Jerusalem, and there remained united in prayer with their friends. At this time, at the suggestion of Peter, the void in the company of the Apostles caused by the treachery of Judas was filled up, while with the participation of the assembled believers in the Messiah, Barsabas and Matthias were nominated as substitutes. Between these the decision was given by lot in favour of Matthias. This account in its general purport might be tolerably unobjectionable, and it is only from the connection in which it stands that doubts might arise against it, on the one hand, because as in the record of the ascension it assumes that the Apostles continued to remain at Jerusalem; and, on the other hand, as it is most closely connected with the Feast of Pentecost as its immediate preparative, and must almost necessarily stand or fall with it. (The first of these points has already been elucidated by Strauss<sup>2</sup> with his usual acuteness, and his reasoning has not as yet been refuted; to the other we shall have occasion to return.) But likewise, irrespectively of this connection, the details of our record contain much, the accuracy of which it is difficult to uphold. Peter can scarcely have spoken the words here attributed to him. We should be reluctant to lay much stress on the fact that the two passages from the Psalms, lxix. 26, cix. 8, are treated as one in the 16th verse, for such inaccuracies in quotation are to be found elsewhere, and in case of doubt might be credited to the Apostle

<sup>1</sup> What *Baedkgarten* (The Acts, or the Process of Development of the Church from Jerusalem to Rome, 1852, i. 11) has recently said to solve the contradiction is to me utterly incomprehensible

<sup>2</sup> Life of Jesus, 3 ed. § 136.

Peter as readily as to Luke; neither would we dwell on the essential incorrectness of interpretation given to both passages,<sup>1</sup> for neither have we any reason to declare this impossible in Peter. On the other side, it is very improbable that Peter, at the most six or seven weeks after the betrayal and death of Jesus, should recount the whole event to an assembly of Jerusalemite Christians as something quite new; that in their presence he should apply the expression πᾶσι τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν Ἰερουσαλὴμ to the inhabitants of Jerusalem; that he who perhaps spoke Aramaic should explain the Aramaic נָבָת בְּתַת by a Greek translation; that like a complete stranger he should designate his own mother tongue and that of his hearers as the ἴδια διάλεκτος αὐτῶν. This remark has obtruded itself so persistently even on interpreters such as Olshausen, that they have only been able to rescue the credibility of our narrative by the hypothesis that verses 18 and 19, or at least 19, are an exegetical interpolation of the author's.<sup>2</sup> But such an interpolation could hardly be made without any announcement or intimation; and moreover in the present case the context of Peter's speech would be utterly destroyed, while with the preservation of the two verses it proceeds quite fluently and naturally. If both verses are omitted, verse 17 interposes most irrelevantly between verse 16 and 20, and neither the ὅτι at the beginning of one, nor the γὰρ at the beginning of the other, is endurable; in addition to which, the ἐπαυλίς in verse 20 obviously refers to the χωρίον, verse 18. If (with Kuinol) only verse 19 should be attributed to the historian, the unfitness of the narration of the betrayer's fate still remains; and if the other difficulties partially fall away, verse 19, connected with its predecessors by a simple καὶ, and continuing with a perfectly similar construction, is even more impossible to separate from the Petrine discourse than are verses 18 and 19 together. If, however, Peter cannot have expressed himself re-

<sup>1</sup> Comp. on this point the commentators on the passages in the Psalms, and Meyer, *Acts i. 20.*

<sup>2</sup> The first opinion is also Schleiermacher's, *Int. to the New Testament*, p. 372.

garding the death of Judas as he does here, the event can also hardly have occurred as our text records it. The statement before us is utterly irreconcilable with the account of Matthew. According to Matthew, Judas dies by suicide; according to Luke, by a misfortune inflicted as a punishment; according to the former, by hanging; according to the latter, by a fall; according to the former, the field of blood was only bought for the well-known object by the priests after the death of Judas; according to the latter, it was purchased as a personal possession with the reward of treason. To this must be added the suspicious relation of our record to the apocryphal one of Papias, and the circumstance that, partly from the general presumption that a signal punishment must have overtaken the traitor, partly from the various passages in the Old Testament which might be applied to him, Christian legend had sufficient inducement to frame both accounts of the death of Judas even without any historical foundation, or on the ground of the simple fact of his early decease. But as this has already been exhaustively discussed by Strauss,<sup>1</sup> we will content ourselves with these indications, and this only may be still remarked: that in ancient tradition other distinguished enemies of the Christian cause perish by a fall. Besides Simon Magus, who is supposed to have been precipitated from the air at the word of Peter, it is likewise said in the Clementine Homilies of his predecessor Dositheus (ii. 24), ἐκείνου τοῦ Σίμωνος στάντος, αὐτὸς πεσὼν ἐτελεύτησεν. As the self-exaltation of the heretics, which is also their apostasy from the true faith, is punished by a fatal fall, so a similar punishment overtakes the traitor who would fain enjoy the possession sacrilegiously obtained; and on his property itself he is overthrown, that he may depart to the place of his punishment. But the more easily the record given in our book of the death of Judas may be accounted for without any historical foundation, and the more doubtful, on the other hand, its correctness and its Petrine origin must become from the circum-

<sup>1</sup> Life of Jesus, Part iii. § 128.

stances above noted, the more undeniably it results, from verses 18 and 19, that the words here attributed to Peter cannot have been spoken by him, and so much the more problematical does the whole narrative of the election of the Apostle appear, related as it is to this discourse; and it is only requisite to shake its historical coherency in other respects to reduce the actual occurrence of it also to an entirely open question. This coherency is to be found retrospectively in the ascension, of which we are obliged to leave the verification to Gospel criticism, and prospectively in the events of the Feast of Pentecost, to which we must now therefore address ourselves.

## 2. THE FEAST OF PENTECOST.

In the account in our second chapter of the events of Pentecost, the phenomena recorded in the second and third verses first attract attention. At the first glance these phenomena probably produce in every one the impression of the miraculous : Ἐγένετο ἀφινω ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἥχος ὡσπερ φερομένης πνοῆς βιαλας καὶ ἐπλήρωσεν ὅλον τὸν οἶκον, οὐ ἡσαν καθήμενοι· καὶ ὥφθησαν αὐτοῖς διαμεριζόμεναι γλῶσσαι ὡσεὶ πυρὸς, ἐκάθισέ τε ἐφ' ἓνα ἔκαστον αὐτῶν. This incontestably looks anything but natural. To modern exegesis, however, the miraculous was partially repulsive, and it endeavoured to remove it by natural interpretation. This itself took a two-fold direction: it either recognized the fact as an outward occurrence, and contested its miraculous character, or else it suffered the last to remain, and, on the other hand, transferred the fact from the world of external reality to the world of imagination and of vision. According to the first assumption, the occurrence in question would be combined with a thunder-storm or a hurricane surcharged with electricity, and the fiery tongues would be the flames of lightning falling on the hall of assembly, or electric sparks such as in a sultry atmosphere discharge themselves occasionally on men, animals and lifeless objects. But neither one nor the other of these electric phenomena could be

described as here ; the *γλῶσσαι πυρὸς*, even on account of their unmistakable relation to the *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν*, cannot be vaguely explained as flames and sparks, and the expression itself demands the literal signification of the word ; it does not say, *ώσει γλῶσσαι πυρὸς*, but *γλῶσσαι ὥσει πυρὸς* ; the *ώσει* refers not to the form of the tongues, but to the fiery substance of these tongues ; but tongues, even if they look like fiery tongues, are something quite different from electric sparks ; moreover, that such sparks should become visible to a whole assembly, or, to be more accurate, should apportion themselves to each individual member and settle on each of them, or that lightning should do exactly this without injuring even one of these individuals, probably no one will deem credible without a miracle. Heinrichs<sup>1</sup> therefore assumes that the disciples, perceiving the descent of the Holy Ghost in the midst of the tempest, exaggerated and adorned the accompanying phenomena out of their own imaginations ; and herewith this form of natural interpretation merges into the second, which was also deemed admissible by Neander,<sup>2</sup> according to which the whole occurrence was a vision occasioned by extraordinary natural phenomena. Even if a vision of this kind appearing to an entire assembly is not without example, our author clearly has not the design to depict such a merely subjective occurrence ; if he rather treats the “rushing mighty wind” as something material ; if he also speaks of *ἐκάθισε* ; finally, if he represents the descent of the Holy Ghost, which must have preceded a vision, as following the distribution of the fiery tongues, and places the speaking with tongues in unmistakable causal connection with the distribution of the tongues, he does not allow us a moment’s doubt that he wishes these appearances to be regarded as something objectively real. We should therefore be obliged to go a step further, and assume that either the persons themselves assembled confounded the in-

<sup>1</sup> In the excursus on our text, p. 319.

<sup>2</sup> History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles, Part iv. p. 14.

ternal with an external occurrence, or else that the tradition, followed by our author, had transformed the former into the latter. In the first case, it is true, the Spirit which filled the disciples could not have been the *πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας*, but rather a spirit of frenzy of which we could not comprehend the further miraculous operations ; in the second case, it is certainly possible that a vision is the fact on which our account is founded ; but it is equally possible that an entirely different fact, or no fact at all, may be before us, for a tradition which confuses visions with objective occurrences would so completely transform its subject that it could have no further pretension to authenticity. Thus the whole of this natural interpretation only tends to impeach the general credibility of the record under consideration, and to cast a problematic appearance over the occurrences concerned, with regard to which criticism is completely at liberty to decide in favour of one view or the other, in case further grounds for decision should present themselves. Let us see whether we encounter any such in the further course of the narrative.

This brings us to the much-debated question of the *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν*. Ancient exegesis, as far as our acquaintance with it extends, is well known to have understood this phenomenon to be a miraculous speaking of foreign languages. According to this, the assembled Christians were supposed, by means of a miraculous operation of the Spirit, all at once to have spoken in various languages hitherto unknown to them. But at a very early period we likewise find the idea to which in more recent times also some individuals<sup>1</sup> gave the preference, i. e. that although the Apostles all spoke in their mother-tongue, Aramaic, the hearers on the other side understood them in their own ; and that the miracle was not so much a miracle of speech as of

<sup>1</sup> An anonymous contributor in the Tübingen Theol. Journal, 1828, 433. *Schneckenburger*, Contributions to the Int. to the New Test. p. 84. Compare with this Neander's (p. 16) quotation from Greg. Naz. Or. 44, p. 715. In the work on the motive of the Acts, Schneckenburger leaves it undecided whether the author wishes a miracle of hearing or speaking to be understood, and equally little does he enter on the question of the objective fact.

hearing. Billroth<sup>1</sup> endeavoured to combine both theories by assuming that the *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν* consisted in speaking a language in which the elements of the actually existing languages were united, a sort of elementary or primitive language, in which each of the listeners must then have heard his own peculiar language. This prodigy we may reasonably trust to its fate, leaving any one who likes to seek the primitive language in the famous gardens of the Hesperides,<sup>2</sup> where doubtless the abstract man may speak it as he proffers the abstract fruit to his visitor. It is true the hypothesis of a miracle of hearing is employed to bring our occurrence nearer to every-day nature by analogy with animal magnetism; but even were this advantage less equivocal than it will prove to be, our text would nevertheless compel us to renounce it in the present case, for when it plainly asserts, *ἥρξαντο λαλεῖν ἐτέραις γλώσσαις, καθὼς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐδίδου αὐτοῖς ἀποφθέγγεσθαι*, it is impossible that the meaning of the historian can be that the speakers uttered, *not* *ἐτέραις*, but *ταῖς αὐταῖς γλώσσαις* as usual, and that only the hearers understood them *ἐν ἐτέραις γλώσσαις, καθὼς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐδίδου αὐτοῖς ἀκούει*. Nothing would thus remain but to hold the historian guilty of a false apprehension of the occurrence, an assumption which we have the less reason to make the less his credibility profits by it; for instead of rendering the matter comprehensible, this explanation only entails the further difficulty that the descent of the Spirit on the disciples had a miraculous effect on the understanding of the multitude on whom the Spirit had *not* descended.

If we now restrict ourselves to the common supernatural view of our narrative, according to which the assembled Christians actually spoke in foreign languages previously unknown to them, this aspect is certainly similarly burdened by no slight difficulties. These difficulties lie partly in itself and partly in the comparison of the speaking with tongues of which Paul informs us in the first Epistle to the Corinthians. If we contemplate

<sup>1</sup> Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians, p. 177 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Strauss, Glaubenslehre, ii. 222; i 246.

our occurrence by itself, the sudden bestowal of fluency in foreign languages can only be regarded as a positive miracle. But the hypothesis of such a miracle is incompatible with a right view of the Divine agency and of God's relation to the world, and, in this particular case, with a correct view of the constitution of the human mind. The arrangement and the qualities of a body may be affected by external influence, but mental aptitudes originate only by means of personal activity and practice ; and it is precisely by this that mind is distinguished from matter, that it is free and contains nothing that it has not put into itself. The external and instantaneous in-pouring of a mental aptitude is a conception which refutes itself. Or if offence be unjustly taken at this dogmatical reasoning, that a miracle of the sort should actually have taken place is contradicted by the analogy of all attested experience ; that it should be imagined by a single individual or by legend, coincides with it. Hence if the historian has only the choice between these two alternatives, according to the rules of historical probability he must decide unconditionally in favour of the second. He would be obliged to do this even if an eye-witness of the supposed miracle stood before him ; so much the more is he compelled to do it when he is dealing with an account which is demonstrably derived from no eye-witness, and is possibly some generations later than the questionable occurrence itself.<sup>1</sup> This considera-

<sup>1</sup> The above likewise includes an answer to the often-repeated assertion that it is not justifiable to reject a narrative merely on account of its miraculous character. The impossibility and incredibility of miracles is quite as much an axiom of all historical criticism as all other internal tokens, according to which it has to direct its decision as to the matter of fact ; just as, for instance, the impossibility that incompatible statements should both be true, &c. ; and whoever will not admit the former will, as daily experience shows us, find little trouble in evading the latter. In every department of historical inquiry this is admitted without hesitation, and why it should be otherwise with regard to Scripture history is not evident. At all events, the burden of proof lies on those who claim for this department special laws differing from all those otherwise recognized. The proof, however, will not readily be made, and it will be difficult to weaken the whole phalanx of reasons with which, from Spinoza and Hume down to Strauss, the possibility and acceptance of miracles have been contested. Till then we are justified in assuming the incredibility of miracle, and in pursuing the following inquiry on that assumption without further remark.

tion is not, in fact, removed when we are referred, as by Olshausen (on this passage) and Baumlein,<sup>1</sup> to the analogy already mentioned, of the magnetic state, in which it is also said to have happened that somnambulists have spoken a language known only to those with whom they were “en rapport.” For even if this pretended fact were as reliable and well accredited as it is the reverse of both, it would prove nothing whatever in favour of a case in which neither somnambulism nor magnetic “rapport” are to be thought of; not to mention that the disciples, according to verse 4, began to speak in foreign tongues even before the multitude was present with whom they were supposed to be “en rapport.”<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, the entire incredibility of the presumed miracle becomes the more clear when we inquire for what object such an unexampled violation of natural law was necessary. Ancient theology is of opinion that the Apostles received the gift of tongues that they might by this means be enabled to promulgate the Gospel universally. But, in the first place, among those assembled at the feast of Pentecost—not to mention the centurion Cornelius, ch. x., and the disciples of John, ch. xix.—certainly only few were ever in a position in their lives to make use of this power, even were we to apply the *ἀπάντες*, ch. ii. 1, to the Apostles only, and not rather to those collectively mentioned, i. 14, which is scarcely to be avoided after this particular passage; for even of the Apostles the majority appear to have made no further missionary journeys. But likewise those who did this, secondly, by no means required all the languages enumerated in our verses 9—11, for Greek and Aramaic, the two languages of Palestine, which must have been previously known to them, would at that time have been sufficient everywhere. Thirdly, and lastly, history

<sup>1</sup> In his treatise on the γλ. λαλεῖν in the Studies by the Evangelical Clergy of Wurtemberg, vi. 2, 118.

<sup>2</sup> The same applies to the interpretation which substitutes the miracle of hearing for the miracle of speech, in order to explain it by somnambulism; besides which, this interpretation would lead to the strange idea that the multitude, collected from curiosity, must one and all suddenly have become somnambulist.

gives no single instance of the gift of tongues being applied to the object of promulgating the Gospel; on the contrary, it offers several proofs of the reverse: from Acts xiv. 11 ff. it appears that Paul did not understand Lycaonian, although according to 1 Cor. xiv. 18 he was mighty in the gift of tongues; and a most ancient tradition<sup>1</sup> records of Peter that he employed Mark as interpreter. With respect to these difficulties, many, renouncing any special object for the miracle, assign to it only the general significance of attesting the apostolic message,<sup>2</sup> and they hereby gain the advantage, as it appears, of being obliged to assume a merely momentary instead of an habitual communication to the disciples of the fluency of speech. Whether this be a real advantage would still be a question, for the magical interruption of the spiritual life of the recipients remains in this case also, and the removal of this interruption and of the fluency communicated by it could only have occurred in the like magical and mechanical manner; but as concerns its ultimate cause, the miracle taken thus, instead of possessing a rational object worthy of its divine author, would be an affair of sheer ostentation, a theatrical exhibition, which might have been replaced by any other sensational phenomenon. If then this deserves even less acceptance than the linguistic preparation of the Apostles for their office, nothing remains but, with Olshausen and others,<sup>3</sup> to declare the gift of languages a natural result and display of the communication of the Spirit, a natural symbol of the uniting power of the Holy Ghost. But then a connection between the effect and the cause must first be traced, or in some way rendered credible: as long as this is either not done at all, or done

<sup>1</sup> Papias ap. Euseb. K. G. iii. 39, 7. Iren. iii. 1 and other passages. *De Wette*, Int. to the N. T. § 99. Against the assertion that Mark was termed ἐρμηνεὺς of Peter, only as his commentator and not as his interpreter, see *Neander*, p. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Thus *Ernesti* and *Kuinöhl*, Comm. p. 45 and f. In a certain sense also *Baumlein*, p. 116.

<sup>3</sup> *Baumlein*, p. 117. *Rossteuscher*, The Gift of Tongues in the Apostolic Age, p. 27 ff. *Baumgarten*, The Acts, i. 48 ff.

only by a few unmeaning phrases,<sup>1</sup> we cannot avoid the conclusion that, as in no other case either religious or any other spiritual communion among people speaking different languages results in reciprocal communication of linguistic knowledge, neither can it have produced this result, at least in a natural manner, at the Feast of Pentecost.

These considerations receive no slight confirmation when we compare our narrative with the remarks of the Apostle Paul on the gift of tongues in the church of Corinth. Without as yet absolutely defining in what this Corinthian gift of tongues consisted, as to its nature and its outward appearance, we can even now pronounce with all certainty what it was *not*, namely, it was not speaking in foreign languages. This is unequivocally evinced by the manner in which the Apostle speaks of it. Not only does he forbear to indicate that condition of tongue-speaking by a single word, but in more than one of his enunciations he absolutely excludes it. In xiv. 18 f he illustrates the saying that to speak with tongues in the church without interpretation is unmeaning, by the example,<sup>2</sup> as he who speaks a foreign language is incomprehensible if I do not know his language, so is tongue-speaking without interpretation incomprehensible. This illustration obviously presupposes that tongue-speaking

<sup>1</sup> To what a degree the confusion of phraseology extends is shown in the conclusion of *Baumgarten*, p. 58. As the loaves of Pentecost represent the entire harvest, and as Israel at Sinai represent all future generations, so is the assembly at Pentecost “the representation of all prospective ages of the Church.” “Now if the individual members of this assembly in fact and in truth possess such a signification and position, can logic offer any objection to their thus appearing?” To this general position certainly not, but assuredly so much the more to the application here made of it. What I merely represent, that I am not; although its qualities may be idealistically imputed to me in imagination, they are not therefore communicated to me in reality. The representative of a prince is not in possession of princely power, and any one representing an Arabian or a Chinese does not therefore know Arabic and Chinese. One would be altogether ashamed to say anything so offensively obvious, if the most modern “faith” had not long since shown that what most frequently escapes it is the very thing which lies nearest to a sound human understanding.

<sup>2</sup> It is only as such, and not as *Baumlein* wishes, p. 92, that the enunciation and application of a general maxim (verse 10) can be taken.

does not itself consist in speaking foreign languages. From the same chapter, verses 13, 27 f., we see that the person speaking with tongues was not always, nay, it almost seems *a rule*, capable of expounding his utterances. How can this be conceivable if speaking with tongues consisted in the use of a foreign language? Although it may occasionally occur that an individual is more fluent in a foreign language than in his mother tongue, yet this cannot have been the usual case, least of all in a Greek capital and a commercial town such as Corinth, where undoubtedly the faculty of Greek expression was lacking only to the minority. Further it appears from ch. xiv. 5, 14 f. 28, that Paul found the gift of tongues (of which he speaks from his own experience) conducive to personal edification; but it is not apparent how it could be more edifying to any one to express his religious feelings in a strange language, not even very comprehensible to himself, in preference to his own. Finally, on this view of tongue-speaking, how could we explain the abuses censured by Paul in the church of Corinth? For miraculous utterances in a foreign tongue assume the special agency of the Holy Ghost while speaking. But how can the Holy Ghost have inspired individuals to speak when it was unseasonable to do so? Or are we to imagine that the gift of tongues was bestowed once for all upon the person concerned, as a faculty to be used or abused according to his fancy; and hence that no further special agency of the Holy Ghost was requisite for its display? In this case it must be shown how that result can be imagined without the most extreme faith in miracles, a spiritual agency which nevertheless acts in special cases without the co-operation of the Spirit, a faculty applicable at will, yet neither natural nor acquired! If this also is incredible, one has only to assume that when speaking in foreign tongues did not serve to edification, it was not miraculous and produced by the Holy Ghost, but a deceptive ostentation. But then is it likely that Paul would have spoken so leniently of such a misdemeanour as he does in 1 Cor.? Would he not certainly have distinguished be-

tween the real gift of tongues, the work of the Spirit, and that which was merely feigned; have set forth marks of the true miracle, and displayed the same severity against the false prophets as in Acts xiii. against the sorcerer Elymas? From what the Apostle says, it is evident that he considers speaking with tongues, even when exercised in the wrong place, as a real fruit of the Holy Spirit; but this it can be only if it is not such an entirely peculiar, absolutely supernatural phenomenon as the miraculous speaking of foreign languages: a phenomenon such as this must, wherever it really existed, have been produced directly by the Holy Ghost; and hence with regard to such, only one of two things would have been credible—an absolutely right use, or a hypocritical misuse.

Now if the Corinthian gift of tongues was not speaking in foreign languages, and this interpretation is still to be maintained with respect to the first Feast of Pentecost, it must be assumed that the two phenomena were essentially distinct on this point; but as their resemblance must be again admitted, if only on account of their bearing the same name, they must be regarded as different varieties within the same species. In this sense Olshausen<sup>1</sup> observes that in the *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν* different degrees and varieties are to be distinguished. The general character of the divine gift (charisma) consisted merely in speaking in an exalted, ecstatic manner; but in individual cases, even if very rarely, it rose into speaking in foreign languages; and as this was especially the case at first, at the Feast of Pentecost, it received the name of *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν*, which it preserved also in those cases in which it did not operate in the same form. But even if it were possible to explain how two such different phenomena were comprehended under the single name of the gift of tongues, and yet in both miraculous speaking in foreign languages took place, it is still very remarkable that, notwithstanding the frequent occurrence of tongue-speaking in the Corinthian church, no trace is to be found of that supposed higher form of

<sup>1</sup> Stud. und Krit. 1829, 3, 545; 1831, 3, 568 ff. Commentary on the same passage.

it, the gift of tongues in its more restricted sense; whereas the Acts not only expressly remarks, in the second instance which it records of speaking with tongues (x. 46 f., xi. 15 f.), that the Spirit displayed itself *in the same manner* as at the Feast of Pentecost, but likewise in the third case (xix. 6), undoubtedly judging by analogy nothing different is contemplated.<sup>1</sup> According to this, one of the two accounts, the relations of which we are now concerned with, must contain all the cases of tongue-speaking in the highest form of this phenomenon, and the other none. Is it not obvious that this conclusion is not deduced as such from the writings in question, but is merely a product of the perplexity attendant on the attempt to harmonize the two? By its description of the gift of tongues, the Acts, taken by itself, would point as exclusively to speaking in foreign languages as would the Epistle to the Corinthians to something different, and it is only the exegete who assumes that both intend to portray a fundamentally similar phenomena, whereas they in fact describe two essentially different phenomena. Finally, if we investigate the possibility of the thing, we are at once repelled, independently of any other consideration, by the notion that the same power of Christian inspiration which usually produced merely an ecstatic utterance in a language known to the speaker, should, when exalted to a higher degree, have produced something differing in kind, an utterance in unknown languages. There is not the slightest connection between the two, and however exalted one may imagine a religious ecstasy to be, it is in no way perceptible how such exaltation of religious feeling could impart a knowledge of foreign languages. It is rendering the refutation of these objections only too easy when it is said, with Rossteuscher,<sup>2</sup> that these two species of tongue-speaking occurred just once, the speaking in foreign

<sup>1</sup> We cannot here more minutely consider the objections adduced against this view of the passages alluded to.

<sup>2</sup> In the work already cited, p. 8 ff., perhaps after *Thierach*, who in his History of the Christian Church in Ancient Times, i. 67, pronounces the same opinion.

languages and the speaking in an utterly incomprehensible language not to be compared to any form of human speech, the tongue of men and of angels (1 Cor. xiii. 1);<sup>1</sup> the only thing common to both was, that they were derived from a transcendental divine inspiration, and referred exclusively to a personal communion of the speaker with the Deity. Holding this view, every question of the credibility of the affair is obviously cut away beforehand by the assertion of its absolute supernaturalism ; but so much the more glaring appears the strangeness of a faith in miracles, where it costs nothing to represent the Holy Ghost as placing in the mouth of his instruments, without any conceivable object, at one moment foreign languages which they could not understand, and at another even a language of angels incomprehensible alike to the speakers and the hearers. Here again recurs the suspicion that such an unqualified inspiration must necessarily have excluded disorders in the use of tongue-speaking. Certainly the historical statement of fact does not entitle us to any such assumptions. The datum before us is not the fact of a two-fold gift of tongues itself, but merely the existence of two accounts, one of which understands by tongue-speaking an ecstatic discourse, in which, however, no foreign languages were employed ; the other, a miraculous power of speaking in foreign dialects. Furthermore, these two accounts are so related to each other, that although we know of one that its author was acquainted by personal experience with the phenomenon which he describes, this is exactly what we do not know of the other; and that the former alone portrays a credible, the latter an utterly incredible occurrence. Under these circumstances we can only judge, according to all rules of historical research, that the first only of these accounts is right ; on the contrary, that the second, so far as it deviates from the other, is wrong.

<sup>1</sup> Rossteucher is likewise reasonable enough not to inquire " whether the angels of the Lord in heaven actually worship in a similar language, and whether those who spoke with tongues actually made use of the same heavenly language ? "

Are we now therefore to abandon the view hitherto received of the narrative of Luke, and throw ourselves into the arms of a natural interpretation of it? It is well known that such an interpretation has been attempted in two ways: it is either assumed that, although, as our record tells us, foreign languages were spoken at the Feast of Pentecost, this was nevertheless no miraculous speaking; or, on the other hand, that the speakers used no foreign languages, and, moreover, that our record does not say so. The first of these interpretations adheres directly to the account in the Acts, the second to that in the Epistles to the Corinthians. The first was that into which the supernatural aspect of the miracle of Pentecost must necessarily pass; the fact of our narrative, the Christians speaking in foreign languages, remained, and it was only as to the cause of this phenomenon that leave was taken to judge differently from the author of the *Acts* and his supernaturalistic interpreters. It is therefore to this explanation that the rationalistic theologians of the old style<sup>1</sup> adhere by preference; among the more modern it is sanctioned by Fritzsche and Hase,<sup>2</sup> though only with important restrictions. According to it, the historical element of our event would be as follows: The infant Christian Church, consisting of Jews of various nations, was assembled in religious meditation on the day of Pentecost, when a blast of wind, or some other natural occurrence, construed by those assembled into a descent of the Spirit, suddenly transported them into a

<sup>1</sup> Compare *Kuindl*, p. 46 ff., and those cited by him. *Schrader*, the Ap. Paul, iv. 185.

<sup>2</sup> Fritzsche on Mark xvi. 17; comp. specially p. 733. Hase, in Winer's *Zeitschrift*, 2nd vol. This scholar expresses himself very cautiously in his History of the Church, Part vi. p. 24, on the event of Pentecost: "At the early celebration of the Feast of Pentecost, after the resurrection, the disciples, on the occasion of an extraordinary event of Nature, felt themselves seized by an inspiration which was regarded as an act of being filled (*Erfülltwerden*) with the Divine Spirit descending from above, and immediately displaying itself in inspired transcendental modes of speech, a speaking in tongues which, at the Feast of Pentecost, according to the unassuming account of Luke, was at the same moment speaking in several foreign languages, which latter, however, was not considered in the Apostolic Church as the characteristic of the gift of grace, and does not occur again."

state of the liveliest inspiration ; in this mood they felt themselves no longer bound by the Jewish custom of praying in the sacred language, Hebrew, but gave free vent to their inspiration by discourses in their mother tongues. Everything would thus have passed most naturally, and all that was objectionable in the miracle of speech would be entirely removed. But, on the other hand, so much the more objectionable, on this hypothesis, becomes the wonder of the auditors at an incident in no degree wonderful. Their surprise is *in part* attributed to the fact that the assembled Christians not only employed foreign languages in general, but also delivered *religious* addresses in these profane languages ; *in part*, it has been assumed that the Christians were erroneously supposed by the hearers to be without exception born Galileans, and, under this impression, their knowledge of those languages was considered remarkable. But if the first explanation must be rejected because it cannot be rendered probable that the Jews, even the most rigid (this is the meaning of εὐλαβεῖς), required the use of the Hebrew language for *all* religious discourses and not only for the liturgical forms of prayer, it is likewise excluded by the distinct words of the text ; for according to v. 7 f. the multitude do not marvel because religious subjects were enunciated in a profane language, but because all manner of foreign languages were heard in the mouths of Galileans. To understand Γαλιλαῖοι as the name of a sect—Christians, or to bring in the collateral idea, *uneducated* Galileans (from whom such boldness could not have been anticipated), is forbidden, in addition to other reasons, by the contrast between the λαλοῦντες Γαλιλαῖοι and the ἴδια διάλεκτος of the auditors, as that points to their linguistic knowledge as the only subject of surprise. But if the astonishment of the multitude was caused by the linguistic knowledge of born Galileans, it is strange to make it rest on a mere error ; for what should have induced the multitude to consider the speakers as Galileans if they were not actually known to them as such ? If foreign languages are heard in a town where strangers from all parts of the world are wont to

congregate, the first thought can only be that foreigners are really present; if any one at the Leipzig Fair hears unknown persons speaking Persian or Armenian, his first impulse is assuredly not surprise that natives of Leipzig should talk Persian or Armenian. Besides, how childish it would be in our author, if the whole astonishment of the multitude rested on a delusion, not only to give no intimation of the fact, but, as far as he was able, to carry on the delusion throughout his whole account! Further, if in v. 9 ff., no less than fifteen nations are mentioned by name, are we to imagine that people of all these nations, Parthians, Medes and Elamites, were present at the first small meeting of Christians? Finally, to what improbabilities does this explanation lead us if we apply it to the speaking with tongues of the first Epistle to the Corinthians! For how would it have been remarkable or incomprehensible if, in the divine worship at Corinth, the Greek language had been used instead of Hebrew which was unfamiliar to most members of the Church? How could Paul have restrained this custom? above all, how could he require an interpreter for those who spoke Greek among Greeks? Or if  $\gamma\lambda.$   $\lambda\alpha\lambda\epsilon\bar{\nu}$  is supposed to have consisted in the use of their native language by foreigners who were present, how could this be considered a special  $\chi\acute{a}ri\sigma\mu\alpha$ ? How could the  $\gamma\lambda.$   $\lambda\alpha\lambda\epsilon\bar{\nu}$  be contrasted with the  $\lambda\alpha\lambda\epsilon\bar{\nu}$   $\delta\bar{\iota}\bar{\alpha}$   $\tau\bar{o}\bar{v}$   $\nu\bar{o}\bar{d}\bar{s}$  and the  $\pi\bar{r}\bar{o}\bar{f}\bar{\eta}\bar{\tau}\bar{e}\bar{\nu}\bar{e}\bar{\iota}\bar{\nu}$ ? How could God be thanked for this gift by Paul, who is not likely to have spoken either Persian or Cappadocian for his private edification? How was the misuse of the charisma possible? One would be obliged to assume an ostentation of linguistic knowledge otherwise censurable by the Apostle.<sup>1</sup> But the use of foreign languages is nowhere mentioned by Paul.

This is the point held by those who exclude speaking in foreign languages from the idea of the  $\gamma\lambda\acute{\omega}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota\bar{s}$   $\lambda\alpha\lambda\epsilon\bar{\nu}$ , and who see in it only a peculiar exhibition of excited religious feeling. Whether they look for this peculiarity chiefly in the external form of the discourse, or in the Spirit therein revealing itself;

<sup>1</sup> Such as Fritzsche, in the above-quoted work, pp. 735, 738.

whether, in the first case, they describe it further, like Wieseler,<sup>1</sup> as a whispered prayer, scarcely audible; or, on the contrary, like D. Schulz,<sup>2</sup> as a shouting and singing of praises, crying Halleluia, and rejoicing; or, like Bleek,<sup>3</sup> as speaking in strange, dark and highly poetic expressions; or whether, in the second case, they talk more vaguely, with Steudel,<sup>4</sup> of a warm and exalted inspired expression of feeling; or more distinctly, with Neander,<sup>5</sup> of ecstacy, the highest grade of inspiration, in which the interposition of thought was specially withdrawn, or, finally, whether they interpret the *expression γλώσση* or *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν*, to mean speaking with the tongue alone, not in clear comprehensible words,<sup>6</sup> or speaking in glosses, antiquated, unusual expressions,<sup>7</sup> or as speaking in new tongues (a new language), *γλώσσαις ἔτέραις, καιναῖς*;<sup>8</sup> or, lastly (*λαλεῖν*, speaking loud), as shouting loud with the tongue.<sup>9</sup> Widely as these views differ in detail, they nevertheless accord herein—1, that no speaking in foreign languages took place in the speaking with tongues; and, 2, that the author of the Acts did not intend to represent it so. Baur alone, to whom the following remarks do not apply, does not agree with the last hypothesis. And it is this very hypothesis which we must most decidedly dispute. That the extraordinary part of the event of Pentecost did not consist in the use of

<sup>1</sup> Studien und Kritiken, 1838, 3, 733, after Bardili and Eichhorn

<sup>2</sup> The Spiritual Gifts of the First Christians, p 140, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Studien und Kritiken, 1829, 1, 32 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Tübingen Journal, 1830, 2, 133 ff.; 1831, 2, 128 ff.; and also Strauss' Streitschriften, 1, 155.

<sup>5</sup> Hist. of the Apost. Age, 4, p. 26. Likewise H. A. W. Meyer, 1 Cor., p. 208, although he acknowledges that the Acts intends to record the speaking of foreign languages.

<sup>6</sup> Wieseler. Meyer holds that *γλ. λαλεῖν* indicates a speaking in which the tongue, moved by the Spirit, appeared to speak independently.

<sup>7</sup> Bleek, in the above-cited, after Herder, G. Meyer and Heinrichs on the passage and in the excursus. This is also approved by Baur, in the Stud. u. Kritiken, 1838, 3, 618, &c. Before, in the Tübingen Journal, 1830, 2, 101, &c., Baur had taken the simple *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν* as equivalent to *γλώσσαις ἔτέραις λαλεῖν*.

<sup>8</sup> Neander and Steudel, in the above-mentioned works; Baur, see the preceding note.

<sup>9</sup> Schulz, in the work before cited.

foreign languages is said to be evident from our narrative itself. In that case, it is maintained, all clearness and picturesqueness would be wanting. It is asked, of what use was it to speak foreign languages (v. 4) before the auditors (v. 6) were present ? But one might equally well ask, on every other view of tongue-speaking, of what use were the discourses of the disciples before the auditors were there ? But the truth is, that our author does not regard the speaking with tongues merely as an agency directed outwards, as speaking for the instruction of others, but, in the first place, as the direct manifestation of the bestowal of the Spirit, and for this, as will be shown below, the miraculous gift of languages was perfectly adapted. Further, it is argued against us, how could *each* of the foreign Jews (according to v. 6) hear *all* the disciples speak the language of his country ? Much stress is laid on this circumstance by Bleek, for instance (in the already cited work, p. 18). But that each heard his own language from all is by no means stated in ver. 6, even according to our explanation. Each hears his own language from one or more, but the author sums up the sayings of the individuals who express this, in the collective speech, "We all hear our own tongue," with precisely the same rhetorical justice as, for example, Paul, in 1 Cor. i. 12, sums up the antagonistic declaration of the Corinthian partizans in the collective speech, *ἐκαστος ὑμῶν λέγει, ἐγώ μὲν εἰμι Παύλον, ἐγώ δὲ Ἀπόλλω*, &c. A further objection has also been made that by some of those present the disciples were thought to be drunk ; and this it is supposed would not be possible on our hypothesis, for the knowledge of a foreign language cannot be a proof of drunkenness.<sup>1</sup> But although the knowledge may not be one, the use may be ; and with reference to this, it is perfectly true, as Baumlein observes, p. 55, that some people have a weakness for showing off their foreign languages when they are excited by wine. Thus it is not even necessary to assume that the mockers of v. 13 were ignorant enough to mistake the foreign languages for senseless gibberish, like those

<sup>1</sup> So, for example, *Neander*, in the above work, p. 22.

Getæ of whom Ovid complains (*Trist.* v. 10, 37): Barbarus hic ego sum quia non intelligor ulli, et rident stolidi verba latina Getæ.<sup>1</sup> Even among us, people of education as we are, many a one would at the first moment make his own reflections were he to see a company in the open street simultaneously make enthusiastic addresses in the most different languages. Still more striking is it that Peter, in his vindication, v. 14 ff., makes no allusion to the miracle of speech, that he parries the suspicion of drunkenness not with the obvious supernaturalism of the occurrence, but with a reference to the early time of day; and it is an insufficient evasion to say<sup>2</sup> that the author gives only an abstract of Peter's speech, for such a striking argument, proceeding so directly from the incident previously recorded, could not, it seems, have been passed over by our author any more than by Peter, or whoever else, being acquainted with the incident, may have composed the speech. But granting even that, with regard to the event of Pentecost, tradition originally knew nothing of the speaking in foreign languages, and that a vestige of this more ancient representation has been preserved in Peter's silence on the subject, it still does not prove that our author did not mean to record anything about foreign languages. And this holds good also against Neander's observation (p. 24), that the words v. 7—12 cannot be literally understood to imply completely different languages, and that, in the majority of the countries named, Greek was at that time more common than the ancient national dialects. The fact is correct;<sup>3</sup> but who tells the historian that our author also knew and considered this circumstance? When Neander, in conclusion (p. 26 f.), appeals in behalf of his view to the tradition of the two first centuries, which was only abandoned at a later period, he relies wholly

<sup>1</sup> The same idea is known to be implied in the expression *βάρβαρος*, and the *לְפָנֵי שְׁמַרְתָּן* of *Isaiah xxviii. 11.*

<sup>2</sup> *Rossteuscher*, p. 99.

<sup>3</sup> At least whence *Rossteuscher*, p. 28, knows that the Jews universally spoke the ancient national dialects, I am not aware. For instance, that in Egypt they spoke Greek, and not Coptic, is shown by the very existence of the LXX.

and solely on a few passages in Tertullian and Irenæus, which refer especially to Montanist prophecy. Of Tert. adv. Marc. v. 8, Neander remarks this himself, but likewise, in the saying of Irenæus quoted below,<sup>1</sup> the reference can scarcely be doubtful. For how does it affect the conception of tongue-speaking in the Acts that the Montanists identified with it their own prophecy, which, from valid causes it is true, was lacking in the gift of language? It does not even enable us to conclude that our narrative was not referred by the Montanist party to the speaking of foreign languages. Still less are we entitled to make the Montanist view of tongue-speaking an universal ecclesiastical tradition of the first two centuries Even Irenæus, for example, undoubtedly contemplates in the passage quoted a speaking in different languages, for which our narrative itself served him as a pattern; for the expressions, omnibus linguis, παντοδοπαις γλώσσαις, scarcely admit any other construction. That such speaking in foreign languages therefore really took place in his time, certainly follows just as little as that the miracles actually occurred to which, for instance, he alludes in ii. 31. Irenæus was credulous enough in such matters, but here, moreover, he appeals only to tradition, which may easily have exalted the Montanist speaking with tongues into the more miraculous species of the Acts. But granting even that the Church in the time of Irenæus knew of no other tongue-speaking than that which alone occurred in their own experience; granting also that this apprehension was in accordance with the actual fact that in the apostolic period, as little as in the second century, no other tongue-speaking existed, what would all this prove concerning the opinion of our author? The construction which he wishes to be put on the phenomena recorded can after all be deduced only from his own explanations.

<sup>1</sup> Adv. haer. v. 6, with reference to 1 Cor. ii. 6: Perfect are those, qui percepérunt Spiritum Dei et omnibus linguis loquuntur per Spiritum Dei, quemadmodum et ipse loquebatur, καθὼς καὶ πολλῶν ἀκούμεν ἀδελφῶν ἐν τῷ ἐκκλησίᾳ προφῆταις χαρίσματα ἔχοντων καὶ παντοδοπαις λαλούντων διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος γλώσσαις καὶ τὰ κρύφα τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς τὸ φανερὸν ἀγόντων.

These, however, are as little ambiguous as possible. If the people present are surprised to hear an assembly composed of Galileans only speaking in their mother tongues—if, to account more fully for this surprise, a long list of nations is appended—if as early as v. 5 it is remarked, with the like intention, that the auditors of the disciples were ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔθνους τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν, it is almost impossible to evade the admission that it was precisely the employment of the languages here enumerated which constitutes the subject of surprise. But then what are we to say to the assertion that speaking foreign languages is not the point treated of here? Are we, like Steudel, to translate the words ἀκούομεν ἐκαστος τῇ ἴδιᾳ διαλέκτῳ ἡμῶν, εν γῇ ἐγεννήθημεν, we all feel ourselves at home as it were? Shall we, like Schulz,<sup>1</sup> attribute the astonishment of the auditors to the fact that the Christians made themselves to be heard in languages other than the sacred Hebrew? Or shall we quiet ourselves with Bleek's<sup>2</sup> evasion, that the disciples probably intermingled with their discourses foreign words from different languages; and that to the foreign Jews, if such a word unexpectedly struck their ear, it might easily have appeared that they heard just their own language or dialect; and, moreover, that the list of nations in v. 9 ff is not to be taken so very strictly? The perverseness of the first of these evasions is at once shown by the observation<sup>3</sup> that διάλεκτος denotes the characteristics of a language solely with reference to its form, and hence that διάλ. εν γῇ ἐγενν. can only mean mother-tongue—not to mention that this explanation would lead to the strangest consequences respecting the speaking with tongues at Corinth.<sup>4</sup> The second rests on the assumption already disproved, that religious discourses were permissible to Jews only in the Hebrew language. On Bleek's representa-

<sup>1</sup> In the above work, p. 149; similarly, Neander, in the earlier editions, 3 ed. p. 19.

<sup>2</sup> The above-quoted work, p. 59.

<sup>3</sup> Strauss' Streitschr. i. 156. The same respecting a second evasion of Steudel's, that the λαλεῖν τῇ ἴδιᾳ διαλέκτῳ implies speaking in the form of expression of the Old Testament, which, in natives of Palestine, could least of all be deemed surprising.

<sup>4</sup> De Wette on this passage.

tion of the matter, it remains quite incomprehensible that the auditors should have fancied that they heard their native tongues, if one or two of their words occurred in Greek or Aramaic discourses, when, according to v. 11, they had followed these discourses long enough to know their import, *τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ θεοῦ*; and it is certainly no less incomprehensible that the Holy Ghost should produce such an eccentric confusion of languages as Aramaic interspersed with Persian, &c., or, otherwise, how the disciples could incorporate in their discourses words from languages which they did not know. But if the last difficulty is to be removed by the assumption of an inaccuracy in the narrative (v. 9—11), it would be much simpler, and at the same time more correct, to say, Our author certainly asserts that all these languages were spoken by Christians on the day of Pentecost, but we, for our part, do not think it credible. The author, it is undeniably evident, wishes his statement to be taken literally; if it cannot be true in this literal sense, nothing remains but the admission that his narrative is not free from unhistorical elements.

In the last edition of his work, Neander resolved to make this admission. He here acknowledges that our historian indeed thought of speaking in foreign languages, whereas probably only an inspired ecstatic, speaking without foreign languages, took place in reality; he recognizes in this feature an ideal element pervading the history; he even accepts for it the name of mythical; but at the same time he declares it an arbitrary principle of criticism to infer the unhistorical character of the entire narrative from single unhistorical features such as these. How far such an inference is reliable or not must, after all, depend in each given case on the importance of those features with respect to the whole of the narrative concerned; apart from this, the opposite axiom, that inaccuracy in particulars proves nothing against the truth of the whole, is likewise an arbitrary principle, and nothing else; for the whole is compounded of the particulars, and has to maintain its credibility by the particulars. We shall

soon see how little, in the very case before us, the speaking in foreign languages is a feature of merely subordinate importance.

Wieseler<sup>1</sup> has endeavoured to unite the two chief kinds of natural explanation in a peculiar manner. Starting with his above-mentioned explanation of  $\gamma\lambda\omega\sigma\sigma\eta\ \lambda\alpha\lambda\epsilon\nu$  (speaking with the tongue *alone*, whispering or mumbling), Wieseler desires this expression to be no otherwise understood in our narrative also; but still at the same time, in order to make allowance for the features which require a speaking in foreign languages, he assumes that a distinction is to be made between the  $\lambda\alpha\lambda\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{e}r\alpha\iota\ \gamma\lambda\omega\sigma\sigma\alpha\iota\varsigma$ , verse 4, and the  $\lambda\alpha\lambda\epsilon\nu\ \tau\hat{\gamma}\ \iota\delta\iota\varphi\ \delta\iota\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\varphi$ , verse 6, verse 4 alone was the actual tongue-speaking; verses 6—12, on the contrary, portrayed the  $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\eta\eta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\ \gamma\lambda\omega\sigma\sigma\omega\nu$ , according to their effect on the assembled Jews; and the surprise of the latter referred only to the fact that Galileans, in whom neither in religious nor linguistic matters any special cultivation was anticipated, should ecstatically glorify the greatness and goodness of God in several languages; but these languages must only be thought of as some few previously known to the speakers, such as Hellenistic, Galilean, Arabic and Aramean. That the latter assertions are inconsistent with the plainest exegetical evidence has already been remarked. When the author allows the Jews present to give vent to their astonishment that *they*, as people of all nations, should hear Galileans speak in *their* languages, this astonishment refers, as unmistakably as possible, to the acquaintance of the Galileans with these languages; and if to account more fully for this surprise, he enumerates no less than fifteen different nations who admit that they hear the Galileans,  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\sigma\sigma\varsigma\ \tau\hat{\gamma}\ \iota\delta\iota\varphi\ \delta\iota\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\varphi\ \eta\mu\hat{\omega}\nu$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \hat{\gamma}\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\acute{\epsilon}\theta\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$ , it is arbitrary in the extreme to say that this enumeration in no way denotes so many different languages, but only about three or four otherwise not unknown in the Palestine of those days. How senseless and deceptive

<sup>1</sup> In the treatise, more than once alluded to, on  $\gamma\lambda\omega\sigma\sigma\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \lambda\alpha\lambda\epsilon\nu$ , Stud. und Krit. 1838, 3, 703 ff., especially p. 744.

would thus be the whole list of nations, together with the Ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ; and what self-delusion in such an assertion as (p. 747) that neither the writer nor his readers could have thought, in the catalogue of those nations, of more languages than the four named above! As if Greek, Arabic and Aramaic, had been the mother tongues of Romans and Persians, Egyptians and Cappadocians; and as if any one could reasonably have been surprised to hear, in intercourse with strangers, a few languages, the knowledge of which was extensive enough in the Palestine of that time. Neither is the case any better with regard to Wieseler's first assumption, the distinction between the λαλεῖν mentioned in ver. 6, and the other in verse 4. When verse 4 says, ἦρξαντο λαλεῖν ἐπέραις γλώσσαις, and verse 6 continues, ἥκουν λαλούντων αὐτῶν τῇ Ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ, it is quite impossible to refer this ἀκούειν to anything else than the λαλεῖν before mentioned; and that it was otherwise with the original readers of the Acts, on account of their knowledge of the nature of languages, is a perfectly unfounded assertion, because the reader's accurate acquaintance with tongue-speaking is accepted without any evidence, and because, after all, he could only frame his conception of the incident at Pentecost from the distinct statements of the record before him. Lastly, Wieseler's conception of the Corinthian speaking with tongues is a decided failure, for it does not explain expressions such as γένη γλωσσῶν, γλώσσαις λαλεῖν (in cases such as 1 Cor. xiii. 1, xiv. 18) γλώσσαι ἀγγέλων, nor yet with regard to the disturbance caused by the tongue-speaking to the devotion of the Church, the necessity of its interpretation for the Church, the possibility of interpretation by others (1 Cor. xiv. 26, 28), and the effects and misconstructions mentioned in 1 Cor. xiv. 27 f.<sup>1</sup> The whole of this attempt at mediation shows only the more clearly how impossible it is to apply a notion of the speaking with tongues, derived from 1 Cor., to the account in the Acts;

<sup>1</sup> On this compare *Hilgenfeld* on the Glossolalogy of the Ancient Church (1850), p 35 ff. In this work in general will be found more detailed discussions on the Corinthian Glossolalogy, and a more complete consideration of the modern literature on this subject, than we can here indulge in.

and consequently how little the latter can be considered thoroughly historical.

After this, the only question can be, how far it is unhistorical. For this, however, we have two criterions: the significance of the demonstrably unhistorical features in relation to the whole of our narrative, and the facility with which they may have arisen from unhistorical causes. The more intimate the connection of statements obviously false with the whole tendency of a narrative, the more credible the origin of this narrative either without any foundation in fact or with a foundation comparatively trivial, the more likely is it that it has no actual basis. The more, too, that which is demonstrably unhistorical is limited to unessential and subordinate features, so much the more genuine history must we conjecture in our narrative. If only one of these tests is applicable, the conclusion as to the unhistorical character of the whole narrative is less reliable; more reliable, it is true, if the first than if the second occurs alone; but if both coincide, their coincidence renders this hypothesis incomparably more probable, and in case no important counter-evidence stands in the way, the probability will mount up to historical certainty.

If we test our book first of all by the former of these criterions, it cannot be overlooked that speaking with tongues, the very feature which affords most scope for criticism, forms the central point of the whole history. The author himself has distinctly announced the point of view in which he regards the event of Pentecost, in the words he attributes (verse 7) to the multitude; the impression produced by the miracle can surely represent only the effect intended by the author, the original signification of the miracle. As to the cause which produced this impression, our book names singly and solely the miracle of languages; and to that alone the surprise of the multitude refers. Therefore, it is precisely in this that the author must have seen the actual point of the events previously narrated. Verse 7, moreover, also indicates it plainly enough. For if the Spirit here makes his descent perceptible by the appearance of fiery tongues, which

distribute themselves among those present, it is obvious that the γλῶσσαι especially, or, what comes to the same, the γλώσσαις λαλεῖν, is to be distinguished as the special and characteristic form in which the Spirit imparted at Pentecost was wont to reveal itself. This is put completely beyond a doubt when we take into account the two passages, x. 44 ff., compared with xi. 15 f. and xix. 1—6. According to the first of these, the bestowal of the Spirit on Cornelius and his household is recognized by the λαλεῖν γλῶσσαις καὶ μεγαλύνειν τὸν θεόν; when Peter and his companions hear this, every doubt is removed that these heathens have received the Spirit even as themselves, and that the baptism of the Holy Ghost, that especial Christian baptism in contradistinction to the baptism of water by John, has been imparted to them. The same supplement of John's baptism is likewise bestowed in the second narrative under similar circumstances; here again it is the γλώσσαις λαλεῖν καὶ προφητεύειν (the latter obviously synonymous with the μεγαλύνειν τὸν θεόν of x. 46, and the λαλεῖν τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ θεοῦ, ii. 11), by which the possession of the especially Christian πνεῦμα is revealed. There is therefore no doubt that speaking with tongues in the sense of our author, the miraculous use of foreign languages, is the specific token of the communication of the Spirit to Christians, the indispensable thing which must not be lacking, and without which he could, least of all, picture to himself the first and the original, the complete bestowal of the Spirit on the Apostles. To him, therefore, this feature is not something "isolated, playing into the history," but the substance, the nucleus of the whole narrative; and it is running diametrically counter to his opinion to set it aside as something subordinate, in order to preserve as a basis of fact in the event at Pentecost something like the following: that the assembled Christians, perchance incited by some occurrence of nature, came forward with enthusiastic discourses; that a general sensation was roused; and that subsequently Peter expounded the principles of the new faith in a lengthy address and gained many converts. This certainly does not exclude the pos-

sibility of holding that such view of the affair may have belonged chiefly to our informant, and that the actual fact may really have been limited to what is sketched above; nay, we ourselves shall have to search the record for the traces of an account in which the use of foreign languages was still lacking. Nevertheless, whether the actual history of our occurrence was really such as we have assumed is as yet problematical, for, after all, the only source of our knowledge of the event of Pentecost is the Acts; and if that event is recorded in the book not merely among isolated unhistorical ingredients of minor importance, but if we are rather obliged to recognize a demonstrably unhistorical feature as the very nucleus of the narrative, we know, so far as we have yet arrived, absolutely nothing of its actual foundation. To the possibility that it is based on an incident such as the one above indicated, is opposed, first of all, with equal justice, the possibility that it has no definite historical foundation at all; and it is completely arbitrary, without further proof, to stamp the first possibility as history, since the legendary embellishment of a real occurrence is in itself no more probable than a mythical fiction. To these remarks another circumstance must be added, which gives great weight to the balance in favour of the latter alternative. We have already pointed out the difference of the statements respecting the locality in which the Apostles sojourned immediately after the death of Jesus and witnessed the appearances of their risen Master, namely, that Matthew transfers these appearances to Galilee, the other Evangelists to Jerusalem; and hence that the former indicates Galilee; the latter, and with them our book, assign Jerusalem, as the residence of the Apostles during the period directly subsequent to their Master's death. If, after Strauss's exhaustive discussion on this point, it is scarcely possible to think of harmonizing the two records, and but the choice of one or other is open to us, not only is the mythical aspect of the resurrection pressed home on the side of Matthew,<sup>1</sup> but, even independently of this,

<sup>1</sup> *Strauss, Life of Jesus, 3rd Part, ii 692.*

his account recommends itself for the reasons, already unfolded chiefly by Strauss,<sup>1</sup> that the withdrawal of the Galilean appearances from the Gospel tradition, and the addition of others in Jerusalem, may be much more easily explained than the opposite course ; that traces of the dispersion of the Apostles after the death of Jesus should still have been preserved ;<sup>2</sup> and moreover, that the passage, Matt. xxviii. 7, when compared with the synoptical parallel passages, has the appearance of greater originality. But if the Apostles returned to their native country after the execution of Jesus, it is very improbable that they were again in Jerusalem so soon as the following Feast of Pentecost ; for scattered and alarmed as they were, they would surely have required considerable time before they would venture to return to the capital, which was so dangerous for them. Only an explicit command from their risen Lord could have impelled them to do this forthwith, and of such we know nothing. Matthew records only the charge to go to Galilee, where they should see Jesus for the last time ; the others do not make them *return* to Jerusalem, but *remain* there. Add to this, that a similar difference of the records occurs not only with respect to the place, but also with respect to the time of the last meeting of Jesus with his disciples ; that the statement of the Acts concerning an ascension on the fortieth day after the resurrection becomes more than suspicious, not only by the counter statements of all our other informants, but also by the counter statement of the author in his own Gospel and by the typico-doctrinal character of the number forty ;<sup>3</sup> that with this reckoning of the ascension-day is closely connected that of the Feast of Pentecost, to which the Apostles are referred at the ascension : thus not only does the account given in our book of the event of Pentecost appear to be partially unhistorical, but the whole framework of the event, the locality and the time, becomes dubious, and the possi-

<sup>1</sup> The same, p. 646 ff.

<sup>2</sup> John xvi. 31. *Justin, Apol.* i. 50 ; *Tr. lxx. 106.*

<sup>3</sup> See Strauss on this point in the above-mentioned work, p. 714.

bility that our account is not based on any definite incident grows more and more probable.

This probability is raised almost to certainty when we observe that the narrative before us may be easily and naturally explained without the assumption of any such foundation in fact. Even if the followers of the crucified Jesus became united but gradually into a more closely knit association, if Galilee was the original scene of this movement, and if its extension to a wider circle, and especially the founding of a church at Jerusalem, required considerable time, it must nevertheless have been easy for tradition to represent this result as instantaneous, and to transfer the birthplace of the Christian Church to Jerusalem. The first was inherent in the nature of religious tradition ; for popular legend, operating less by reflection than by imagination, and aiming less at a rational causal connection than at picturesque effect, likes in general to contract a lengthened process into one main fact, or into a few main facts, and to combine into well-rounded pictures, perceptible at a glance, the particulars which discursive thought separates. This inclination lies especially in the nature of *religious* legend, which, owing to its peculiar pragmatism, prefers to trace up every occurrence to the immediate, and therefore instantaneous, interposition of the Deity. The same procedure must also have been followed in the present case by religious legend, or by a writer working in a similar spirit. The Christian Church was by this time in existence as an apostolic institution. If it was asked, what rendered the founding of the Church possible to the Apostles ? the universal answer was, the possession of the Holy Spirit, the πνεῦμα θεοῦ or Χριστοῦ, with which the credentials of the apostolic office were generally allied (comp. 1 Cor. vii. 40). But if it was further inquired, whence came this possession ? it could only be said, Christ bestowed the Spirit on them ; and this bestowal, according to the religious view of history, could be apprehended only as instantaneous, taking place at a definite moment and on a definite occasion. In itself, indeed, this might

have been transferred to the period of Christ's earthly ministry, and it is actually promised (Matt. x. 20) to the Apostles at their first mission, that the Spirit of the Father should speak in them. But the notion seems to have been entertained at an early period that the Spirit, as the representative of Christ, could only be transmitted from him to the Apostles after his personal disappearance from the earthly scene;<sup>1</sup> the same assumption was already demanded by the imaginative need of fixing the bestowal of the Spirit as the opening appearance of the Apostles' independent ministry. In John indeed, xx. 22, it is the glorified Christ himself<sup>2</sup> who bestows the Spirit on the disciples personally; but the act of this bestowal seemed still more solemn and significant if it was represented not merely as the conclusion, and, as it were, a supplement to the earthly ministry of Jesus, but as the independent commencement of a new era,—if, some time after the last farewell of Jesus upon earth, the Spirit should descend with all the paraphernalia of a divine manifestation (Theophanie) on those who awaited him. The scene of this occurrence would most naturally be laid at Jerusalem, if only because it had soon become habitual to seek<sup>3</sup> there the place of the appearance of the risen Christ, and therefore also the abode of the Apostles at that time, but chiefly because Jerusalem not only became very early the seat of the infant Christian community and the residence of its leaders, but because it was also in all probability, and really in a certain sense, the birthplace of the Christian Church. That is to say, as the followers of Jesus, driven away to their homes, seem first to have re-assembled there, and, on the announcement of his resurrection, to have gathered the courage necessary for such enthusiastic adherence to him, so the unanimity with which all our records transfer the seat of the primitive community to Jerusalem, leads us to infer that it was really here that they first

<sup>1</sup> Comp. John xvi. 7, vii. 39, and *Schwegler*, Montanism, pp. 187 and 163 f.

<sup>2</sup> Not merely the risen Christ. See *Baur*, Researches concerning the Canonical Gospels, p. 223 ff.

<sup>3</sup> For the grounds of this assumption, see *Strauss*; elsewhere, p. 649.

openly appeared as a party, and that they formed themselves here into a church. In this respect, therefore, our record seems to rest on a true historical reminiscence, even though the assertion can scarcely be correct that after the death of Jesus the Apostles remained uninterruptedly at Jerusalem, and there beheld their risen Lord.

If now, however, besides the place, the *time* of the bestowal of the Spirit was also to be more accurately defined, it was requisite, on more general grounds, to fix it as near as possible to the departure of Jesus from earth; it was also fitting, for its own sake, that it should take place on some solemn occasion, best of all at one of the national religious festivals; and as none of these occurred so soon after the death of Jesus as the Feast of Pentecost, this of itself would have led to the selection of the latter. Meanwhile, another motive spoke in its favour. The Feast of Pentecost—to which Schneckenburger<sup>1</sup> justly calls attention—is to the Jews of the present day, and was doubtless also to their predecessors, the festival of the Sinaitic legislation—the festival of the Jewish theocracy. Now if at an early date (comp. Gal. iv. 21 ff, &c.) the new community was compared with the old one, the law of Christ with the law of Moses, it was in the nature of the thing that, besides the merits and import of the two, the ways and means of their institution, should likewise become a subject of comparison; and how far this comparison was soon carried is shown by two passages of the Epistle to the Hebrews, ii. 2—4; xii. 18—24. In these passages, the *μερισμοὶ πνεύματος ἀγίου*, the *πανήγυρις καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρωτοτόκων*, are already contrasted with the speaking of angels and the whole paraphernalia of the Sinaitic legislation. How natural it was, if these parallels were carried on by others also to the time at which the two institutions took place, and the renovation of the theocracy by the institution of the Messianic community was attributed to the same day as its original foundation!

<sup>1</sup> Beiträge, &c., in which Buxtorf, *Synagoga Judaica*, c. xx. (c. xv. p. 353, would be more correct) is referred to. Zweck der Apg. p. 198 ff.

But this same point of view seems to have influenced the further structure of our narrative, although it would scarcely suffice by itself for its complete explanation. We see by the first Epistle to the Corinthians that even in the apostolic times an extraordinary value was attributed by many to the gift of tongues, and that it was precisely in this that the highest and most unmistakable proof of the possession of the *πνεῦμα* was sought. In what this phenomenon really consisted may here remain unexamined, and only in passing it may be remarked that Neander's view (the applicability of which to the Acts we should be obliged to dispute) seems to us to come nearest to the truth. According to it, we think of speaking with tongues in relation to the *thing* itself, as speaking in a state of ecstatic inspiration, the form of which undoubtedly differed externally, according to the idiosyncrasy, education and disposition of the speaker (the *γένη γλωσσῶν*, 1 Cor. xii. 28); and, for want of more exact information, it can only be described by analogy with similar conditions in Montanists, Camisards, Quakers, Irvingites, &c. With regard to the *expression* of it, not only does Wieseler's explanation appear to us incorrect, for the reasons already given, but we should also be sorry to assent to the opinion of Bleek, partly because the use of glosses or antiquated expressions is by no means identical with a dithyrambic recitation, into which Bleek subsequently transmutes it, partly because to us, as to others, it seems improbable that a learned technical term of grammarians should be the one used by preference respecting a phenomenon so obviously evolved from the soil of popular religion. The true explanation rather seems that according to which the *γλῶσσα* signifies the tongue or language of the Spirit;<sup>1</sup> which, however, owing to its varieties of form, might equally well be described as a plurality of *γλῶσσαι*, as the one *πνεῦμα* itself was described as a plurality of prophetic *πνεύματα* (1 Cor. xiv. 32; comp. Rev. i. 4, iii. 1, xxii. 6; 1 John iv. 1). However this may be, besides

<sup>1</sup> For the ideas of tongue and language amalgamate here in conception as in expression.

the fact of speaking with tongues, it is also certain that a large party regarded glossolaloy as the specific token of spiritual endowment. Even the expressions, *τὰ πνευματικὰ, τῷ πνεύματι προσεύχεσθαι*, &c., would prove this, if it were not clearly evinced by the whole of Paul's argument against this view. For why the emphatic assertion of the principle that every testimony of Christ is a *πνευματικὸν*? why these reiterated details of the indispensable variety of spiritual gifts, these admonitions against the exaltation of one member over the other, these declarations of the subordinate value of glossolaloy and its comparatively slight use? why all this, if Paul was not dealing with people who did not acknowledge these very truths, who did not recognize the other charisms, like the gift of tongues, as *πνευματικὰ*, who required that all members should be one thing only, that every one without exception who was possessed of the Spirit should prove his claim by means of glossolaloy? That these ideas and requirements did not belong only to some few, is already proved by the zeal and detail with which they are refuted by the Apostle; and that they were not restricted to the Corinthian church is partly probable in itself, and partly evident from the above-mentioned terms, *τὰ πνευματικὰ, &c.*, which appear here as standard expressions, naturalized in the universal language of Christianity, from which Paul also, for this reason, does not abstain. If, accordingly, glossolaloy passed for the specific exhibition of the Spirit, it could naturally be wanting least of all at its first and most glorious bestowal. From this stand-point, the outpouring of the Spirit, as is likewise indicated in Acts ii. 17 f., could not be thought of without the *προφητεύειν*, or glossolaloy.

That, under such circumstances, the latter was transformed into the miracle of languages, might be simply explained by the misunderstanding of a later period, and from the universal tendency of legend to progressive enhancement of the miraculous,<sup>1</sup> especially if (with Baur) the use of expressions from foreign

languages (the *γλῶσσαι* of Bleek) is received as part of the original idea of tongue-speaking. Meanwhile, two other particulars come in here to complete and to explain: on one side, the parallel pursued by Schneckenburger between the Sinaitic legislation and the Messianic conceptions; on the other side, the Pauline universalism of our author. The plurality of languages, according to Gen. xi., was a consequence of rebellion against God; till then there was one language on earth. The uniformity of language had been still greater in Paradise, where the serpent communed in one language with mankind; a trait without significance in Genesis, but which, judging by Philo<sup>1</sup> and Josephus,<sup>2</sup> had acquired no slight importance in Jewish mysticism. This alone involved the requirement that in the Messianic kingdom, at the *ἀποκατάστασις πάντων*, unity of language should likewise be restored, which was also necessary, if only because all the righteous would here be united into one people of God. Accordingly it was then really expected that at this time there would be, as it is said in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Jud. xxv., *εἰς λαὸς κυρίου καὶ γλῶσσα μία*.<sup>3</sup> A type of this Messianic union of languages was discovered in the Sinaitic legislation. According to Philo and several rabbis (evidence of this may be found in Schneckenburger), a voice on that occasion issued from Sinai, and announced the divine commandments to all nations in the seventy languages of the world. What could be more opportune than to recognize the new spiritual language of the Christians as the expected Messianic one;

<sup>1</sup> De conf. ling. p. 321 Hosch. Λέγεται γάρ, ὡς ἄρα πάντ' ὅσα ζῶα χρεσταῖα καὶ ἐννῦδα καὶ πτηνά τὸ παλαιὸν ὄμοφωνα ἦν, but, as the serpent misemployed the language to corrupt mankind, ἐτρόγλωττα τιθῆντο ἐγένετο, ὡς ἐξ ἑκείνου μηκέτ' ἀλλήλων ἐπακοῦσσαι δυνηθῆναι χάριν τῆς ἐν ταῖς διαλέκτοις, εἰς ἃς ἡ μία παὶ κοινὴ πάντων ἐτριήθη, διαφορᾶς. But Philo himself considers this story as mythical.

<sup>2</sup> Antiq. i. 1, 4 ὁμοφωνούντων κατ' ἑκεῖνο καιροῦ τῶν ζῶων ἀπάντων, and in the following, where the punishment of the fall is spoken of as ἀφείλετο δὲ καὶ τὴν δφω τὴν φωνήν.

<sup>3</sup> Schneckenburger aptly compares with this Plut. Is. et Os. c. 47, according to which it was a Zoroastrian doctrine that, after the defeat of Ariman, ἔνα βίον καὶ μίαν πολιτείαν ἀνθρώπων μακαρίων καὶ ὄμογλώσσων πάντων γενεσθαι.

and how natural was it, at a time when the original nature of the phenomenon was unknown, to adopt the idea that, at least on the first and most abundant bestowal of the gift, an actual unity of language took place, that the Spirit spoke in the tongues of all nations, especially if, by fixing this occurrence on the day of the promulgation of the law, the parallel with the universal language of Sinai was rendered easy!<sup>1</sup> The way in which the gift of tongues is imparted in the Acts is, moreover, so like the corresponding occurrence at Sinai, that it would be difficult to believe in a merely accidental coincidence of the two accounts; for as here a noise ( $\hat{\eta}\chi\sigma\delta$ ,  $\phi\omega\nu\eta\jmath$ ) resounds from heaven, then fiery tongues appear, and distribute themselves among the individuals, and, in consequence, people of all nations hear various languages from their lips; so Philo makes an invisible voice ( $\hat{\eta}\chi\hat{\eta}$ ) to be formed by God in the air, which the air then shapes into a flame, and which issues from this stream of fire transformed into the mother tongue of the listeners; and some rabbis make the one voice proceeding from Jehovah divide first into seven voices, and then into the languages of the seventy nations. If the phenomena of our verses 2 and 3 are already foreshadowed here, their symbolism is also so simple and so entirely in keeping with the usual style of spiritual revelations,<sup>2</sup> that it may not only be easily explained, even without any definite prototype; but it was almost required by the stand-point of the ideas of that period. A basis of fact is quite superfluous for this portion of our narrative.

If the story of the miracle of language, in the sense of our book, might thus have been evolved, even without any particular object in view, it becomes perfectly explicable in a writer for whom the event of Pentecost acquired a peculiar value by this very means. If we may be allowed to anticipate the position assumed in the third Part of this work, that the universal des-

<sup>1</sup> De Decalogo, p. 748 ff. in *Schneckenburger*.

<sup>2</sup> Rabbis tell of even individual wise men that they were surrounded during the study of the law by a light resembling that emitted from Sinai. See *Kuinol*, Comm., p. 36; *Schöttgen*, Hor. Heb. on *Acta* ii. 2.

tination of Christianity is one of the essential and leading objects of our book, we cannot remain in doubt as to the significance of the miracle of language in our account. It was only by this version that the story of Pentecost was enlisted in the service of that idea; for it was not possible to announce more solemnly and conspicuously that the new religion was destined for all nations, than if the divine Spirit itself, on its first descent on the day of institution, furnished the Church of the Faithful with the languages of all nations. Hence if the episode was unknown to more ancient tradition, at all events our author had such weighty incentives for his account, that we can perfectly comprehend them, even if speaking in foreign languages never took place in reality.

It must be reserved for a later part to investigate the origin of our record. For our immediate object we restrict ourselves to the question from which we started: whether, as far as the existing indications can be followed, the narrative before us was based on any definite fact. After what has been said, we can only reply in the negative. The demonstrably unhistorical elements of this narrative, as we have seen, concern not only its outworks or single subordinate features, but its real nucleus and focus; nay, the entire groundwork on which it moves is highly uncertain, and according to all appearance there seems to be no scope for any fact which could serve to explain it. Neither do we require any such fact to render its origin credible; as it is in all respects perfectly explicable by dogmatic motives and typical points of view. Where all negative and positive tokens of the unhistorical coincide so completely; where, on the other hand, all traces are missing of the existence of any particular basis of fact,—discreet criticism, although it cannot venture utterly to deny the possibility of some basis of fact, will all the more steadfastly maintain that such an assumption has an overwhelming probability against it, and that the fact, if it existed, must have been distorted beyond recognition in our record.

If we look back to the story of the completion of the college

of the Apostles, given in the first chapter, we can now pronounce with certainty, what was previously stated merely as a possible case, that it, too, even independently of the supposed speech of Peter, cannot, as it lies before us, correspond to historical reality. As the Apostles, at the time named, had most probably not returned to Jerusalem at all, they cannot then have completed their number by the selection of Matthias; and as the mention of this proceeding appears in our book in unmistakable connection with the story of Pentecost,—as the band of Apostles must be completed before the day of Pentecost, that all its members may share in the outpouring of the Spirit,—its veracity is entirely dependent on that of the occurrence of Pentecost. It is not intended hereby to deny that a successor was given to the traitor Judas: although we cannot appeal in behalf of that assumption either to Rev. xxi. 14 or to 1 Cor. xv. 5, it is evident from these passages what value was attached to the exactly twelve-fold number of the Apostles on account of its typical significance, and how the *δώδεκα* became the standard term for the band of Apostles in Palestine, to whom Paul also applies this name at a time when it cannot have numbered more than eleven members.<sup>1</sup> From this point of view it seems very natural that the number twelve should be completed after the defection of the betrayer; that this took place through the selection of Matthias, we may the more readily believe our author, as the name would scarcely be stated without any historical grounds, and the casting of lots has at least nothing against it. But that the act was undertaken exactly at this moment, and not rather at a later period, after the gradual establishment of the little community, is, for all the reasons given, highly improbable.

With the truth of the occurrence of Pentecost, falls away of itself the assertion in our 41st verse of the sudden increase of the community by 3000 members. It is true, if that miraculous story is allowed to pass as entirely historical, one cannot be surprised at such a sudden and brilliant result, but rather that

<sup>1</sup> Many copies therefore have in 1 Cor. v. 5, *ενδέκα*.

a conspicuous miracle did not have a still greater effect. Whoever, on the contrary, thinks himself obliged to reject the fact of the miracle, will form a different conception of the spread of the faith in Jesus, and will necessarily think of it conformably with all other experience, as having been more gradual. How soon the new community attained the number here specified, of course cannot be determined from this standpoint; but that its increase can scarcely have proceeded according to the scale of our book has been justly asserted by Baur.<sup>1</sup> When this account makes the Christian community rise in one day from 120 members (i. 15) to 3000 (ii. 41), and subsequently to 5000, Baur replies that the first number is obviously placed too low, for Paul (1 Cor. xv. 6) knew of a meeting of more than 500 brethren soon after the resurrection; the two others, on the contrary, are too high, and even the persecution occasioned by Stephen would not allow us to think the community at Jerusalem as large as we should be obliged to think it, according to ii. 41, iv. 4, v. 14, vi. 1, 7. Even if it be said<sup>2</sup> that the 120 in i. 15 does not include the total number of Christians at that time, it is nevertheless to be observed that our book at least neither knows nor can know anything of Christian communities outside of Jerusalem (for according to i. 4, 8; Luke xxiv. 49, the Apostles did not quit Jerusalem before the ascension); while, on the other hand, an assembly of 500 Christians, as mentioned by Paul, presupposes more than merely isolated adherents of the crucified Jesus, and yet at least the great majority of Christians in Jerusalem must have been among the 120. As regards the persecution of Stephen, Neander, it is true, believes that all the Christians in Jerusalem were not affected by it. But it is certainly evident from viii. 1, *πάντες τε διεσπάρησαν πλὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων*, that our author wishes to represent the affair in that light; yet on this assumption it would remain incomprehensible that no trace

<sup>1</sup> *Paulus*, p. 37.

<sup>2</sup> *Neander*, p. 7. *Baumgarten*, i. 29. *Lechler*, *Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Age*, 155.

should be found in Josephus of disturbances by which more than 5000 men were driven from Jerusalem;<sup>1</sup> still more incomprehensible, certainly, that during such a vehement and comprehensive persecution the well-known leaders of the persecuted party should be able to remain undisturbed under the very eyes of their opponents. If it is finally asserted<sup>2</sup> that an intentional diminution or increase of the numbers would require too much “cunning” for an account so artless as ours, this is a misapprehension. It is not here a question of much art or deep design,<sup>3</sup> but of the hypothesis that the author of the Acts worked according to a fragmentary preconception, through which the basis of fact was partially distorted; just what Neander himself has admitted on the occasion of the occurrence at Pentecost.<sup>4</sup> If the day of Pentecost was once regarded as the day of founding of the community, it was inferred, not unnaturally and without great “cunning,” as a corollary, that before that moment it cannot yet have acquired any important magnitude. The precise numbers in which our account expresses this are of course more or less arbitrary; perhaps also in part derived from traditions or estimates, the sources of which we do not know. But in the three thousand, ii. 41, the three is conspicuous, as the usual round number representing a small plurality; as in the statement about the 120 primitive numbers of the community, i. 15, the twelve-fold number of the tribes of Israel and of the Apostles: 120 are twelve decades, one for each Apostle. That

<sup>1</sup> It has indeed been doubted whether all who were baptized at the Feast of Pentecost belonged to the church at Jerusalem, but this is the author's meaning as to the 5000, iv. 4, at least. That he intends nothing else in ii. 41 is probable, partly by the analogy of iv. 4, partly by the connection of the passage with the one following.

<sup>2</sup> Neander, in the work quoted.

<sup>3</sup> I say *here*; we shall still find opportunity later to make acquaintance with the supposed artlessness of our book.

<sup>4</sup> We find quite similar cases in allied domains of legend, when, for example, *Nikomachus*, in Porph. Pyth. 20, records that Pythagoras gained over 2000 people by his first address in Italy, and that they thereupon, like the first Christians, lived together, with a community of property. More on this will be found in the third division of the third Part

this was really the connection of ideas which influenced our author cannot of course be maintained, but yet from the above remarks we may infer the possibility of the unhistorical origin of these numerical statements.

### 3. THE INTERNAL CONDITION OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH; THE MIRACULOUS ACTIVITY OF THE APOSTLES; THE COMMUNITY OF PROPERTY, ANANIAS AND SAPPHIRA.

Of the internal condition of the church at Jerusalem our book has the three general descriptions, ii. 42—47, iv. 32—37, v 11—16 If from these we wish to extract the more definite features, in addition to what is said about the attachment of the church to the Apostles and the daily observation of their meetings for divine worship, three characteristic statements become conspicuous: the continued connection of the new church with Judaism, the miraculous agency of the Apostles, and the community of property of the primitive Christians.

“They that believed,” it is said, ii. 46, “continued daily with one accord in the Temple, breaking bread from house to house.” Peter and John accordingly go at once to the Temple at the hour of prayer, and all the Apostles likewise appear, v. 21, 42, teaching in the Temple ; and v 12, the general assurance is repeated, ἡσαν ὅμοθυμαδὸν ἀπαντες ἐν τῷ στοῷ Σολομῶνος. We have the more reason for giving credence to this assertion, as the Acts declares later that the primitive Apostles and their church rigidly adhered to the Mosaic law (xv. and xxi. 20 ff.), and as all other notices lead to that issue<sup>1</sup> The two other points are more suspicious. Even if we do not enter on the individual miraculous narrations which we shall meet with later in their historical connection, we must still be repelled by the general description of the wonder-working agency of the Apostles. After (ii. 43) the many signs and wonders effected by them have been briefly

<sup>1</sup> *Baur*, Paul, pp. 126 ff. *Schwegler*, Nachap. Zeitalter, i. 89 ff.

mentioned, it is recorded with more detail (v. 12, 15 f.) that by the hands of the Apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people, insomuch that they brought forth the sick into the streets and laid them on beds and couches, that at least the shadow of Peter passing by might overshadow some of them. There came also a multitude out of the cities round about unto Jerusalem, bringing sick folks and them which were vexed with unclean spirits, and they were healed every one. Modern apologetics have made very light of this remarkable passage. In Neander's comprehensive work, not a word is to be found respecting the wonder-working shadow of Peter. Is it, perchance, for the reason by which the author (p. 72) excuses the omission of a similar knotty point, the miraculous liberation, v. 19, that as an historian he was justified in selecting, among the narrations, those which seemed adapted to a pragmatic object? This reason might deserve a hearing were the pragmatic object of the author to facilitate the labour of apology, but if, on the contrary, it is the pragmatism of our book with which we are concerned, then the miracle of which we are speaking must not be omitted, for to our book it is anything but indifferent. The miraculous power of the Apostles, transcending all else, forms an essential feature in the ideal portrait of the primitive church, and is, at the same time (according to ch. v. 13 f.), the immediate explanation of that veneration for the Apostles which (verse 26) constrained even the Sanhedrim to show them forbearing consideration. It is exactly a feature like this which a pragmatic historian ought least of all to have omitted, if indeed he really gave it credence. But such credence may have been somewhat difficult even to the supernaturalism of Neander. If a miraculous power which heals all the sick without distinction (ver. 16, *ἐθεραπεύοντο ἀπάντες*), is in itself incredible to more enlightened ideas, this incredibility is raised to complete magic and legend when the mere shadow of the wonder-worker is also supposed to exercise a similar effect. That the shadow of Peter actually did this is indeed not expressly said in verse 15; but our author

evidently intends the words at the conclusion of the 16th verse, *οἵτινες ἐθεραπεύοντο ἄπωντες*, to be referred to the 15th, and not that the belief in the miraculous power of that shadow should be regarded as a superstition refuted by the result. Had his opinion been otherwise, he must inevitably have intimated it in some manner if he did not purposely wish to give occasion to the grossest misunderstanding. But if one is sufficiently unprejudiced to acknowledge this, can all that is repulsive in the magical working of miracles be removed by Olshausen's remark, that it was not indeed Peter's shadow that was curative, but the power of God in the Apostle, and that where there was pure child-like faith it was not put to shame;<sup>1</sup> or by the kindred observation of Meyer, that as the miraculous power of Peter was analogous to that of Jesus, Peter also healed without the mediation of bodily contact, and if this effect was ascribed to his shadow, he himself was guiltless of such superstition? But where is there a trace in our records that Peter in any way had respect either to the belief of the sick or their religious temperament, that he ever exercised or withheld his miraculous power in accordance with it, or that he ever placed himself in conscious personal relation to it? He passes by, his shadow touches those who wait, and they depart all healed. On the other hand, where is the "pure child-like faith" which must be assured, that it may not be put to shame? They hope to be whole when the shadow of the Apostles strikes them, and that is all. "Child-like" this hope undoubtedly is; nay, more than child-like; but "pure" we should be reluctant to call a belief which cleaves to the most sensuous externality, instead of the spiritual, and expects to be healed by the shadow of an Apostle. Finally, what a conception of the wonder-working power, if it is supposed passing even through the shadow of an Apostle, to pour itself, like an electric fluid, indiscriminately on all the needy! That such effects were in no way repugnant to the standpoint of the primitive Christian period, we are well aware; but that they

<sup>1</sup> Similarly Baumgarten, on the same passage.

were also possible in reality, we can scarcely be required to believe; at any rate, the analogy of the miraculous power of Jesus, to which we are referred by Meyer, could only afford evidence if the analogous narratives of the Gospel history were not opposed by the same considerations as our own: it proves only that our record is framed in the same taste as those.<sup>1</sup>

As in the miracles of the Apostles the power of the Spirit presents itself in outwardly striking effects, so does this same power act as ruling the heart in the internal harmony of all the members of the community, and, according to our account, finding its highest expression in a complete community of property. That our author intends to record such, has indeed been doubted. Thus Neander, for instance, observes (p. 39), that as the first Christians formed no secluded monastic association, but lived on in their previous civic relations, a complete community of goods could scarcely be thought of with regard to them, and in our book even this hypothesis is contradicted by the passages, v. 4, vi. 1, xii. 12. This is quite correct as far as the actual fact is concerned;<sup>2</sup> and to those adduced may be added the further arguments of Baur (Paulus, p. 31), that the transaction of Barnabas, who bestows on the community the price of his land, could not be distinguished as something peculiarly creditable if this proceeding was regarded as the general rule; and that it is incredible that, in a community reckoning 5000 men, all should have sold even their houses, so that none could have any longer possessed a dwelling of his own. Yet it is equally undeniable that the Acts speaks of an actual and complete community of property. Πάντες οἱ πιστεύοντες εἶχον ἄπαντα κοινὰ, καὶ τὰ κτήματα καὶ τὰς ὑπάρξεις ἐπίπρασκον, καὶ

<sup>1</sup> A more absurd answer could scarcely have been given to the above deduction than that of *Lange*, *Apost. Age*, i. 87: "We must distinguish between the literal and the historical expression; according to our method of interpretation, the words, 'Napoleon's little hat electrified the army,' for instance, would mean that this hat was actually an electric machine," &c.

<sup>2</sup> Only the saying of Peter, v. 4, that it was open to Ananias to keep his property, we should be reluctant to adduce, for this would also be possible if the community of property, although universal, was at the same time voluntary.

διεμέριζον αὐτὰ πᾶσι, καθότι ἂν τις χρείαν εῖχε (ii. 44 f.). Οὐδὲ εἰς τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ ἔλεγεν ἴδιον εἶναι, ἀλλ’ ἡν αὐτοῖς ἀπαντά κοινά Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐνδεής τις ἵπηρχεν ἐν αὐτοῖς (comp. with this, vi. 1). "Οσοι γὰρ κτήτορες χωρίων ἢ οἰκιῶν ὑπῆρχον, πωλοῦντες ἔφερον τὰς τιμὰς τῶν πιπρασκομένων (iv. 32, 34). These statements sound so general and distinct, that it is quite impossible to consider them merely as a description of Christian brotherhood, which levelled the inequalities of property by unbounded benevolence. It is true we are told that we must not take everything literally here, that our picture must be understood *cum grano salis*;<sup>1</sup> but this admission must be so much enlarged, that it would be simpler and more correct to speak of an unhistorical exaggeration. For even if a community of property in the Essene sense was not enjoined on the first Christians as a binding law of their association (comp v 4), it is, on the other hand, said most unequivocally that all owners of houses and lands sold their estates for the general benefit. In reality, however, only a comparatively small number can have done this, unless the community were thenceforth to become foodless and roofless; for, like Baumgarten, to limit the estates sold (1 69) to those with which their owners were able to dispense, is to abuse the plain words of the text. Thus we have not here merely a hyperbolical expression, such as each can easily correct for himself, but an unhistorical statement, from which, in order to come nearer to the truth, we must at all events subtract a considerable portion. How far this unhistorical portion may extend, in the absence of all other sources, only uncertain conjectures are possible at the best. It is possible that among the first Christians were to be found many who, in religious enthusiasm and in expectation of the approaching kingdom of God, which should of itself soon make an end of the present system of the world, would give away their fortune; but it is equally credible that our record is founded on no definite element of fact, but merely

<sup>1</sup> *Neander*, p. 40. *Lechler*, p. 185.

on the lofty conceptions of a later period regarding the state of the original Apostolic Church.<sup>1</sup>

The significance attributed by our author to the community of property in the primitive Church is also specially displayed in the heavy punishment which is visited on Ananias and Sapphira on account of their dishonourable prevarication (v. 1—11). This incident has justly been offensive to a great many commentators, not merely as a miracle, but far more as a hard vindictive miracle little suited to the spirit of the gospel; and attempts have been made to remove the stumbling-block by natural interpretation, and to represent the death of the wedded couple as a physical effect of the emotion produced in them by Peter's words. More unprejudiced exegetes, such as De Wette and Meyer, have acknowledged the inadmissibility of this evasion, and Baur in particular (*Paulus*, p. 24 ff) has demonstrated it, in opposition to Neander, with a clearness and acuteness to which the latter has not responded in his last edition. It also requires a great deal to make it seem likely in a natural way that an effect which is certainly very rare, such as sudden death in consequence of mental emotion, should have recurred twice within a few hours in connection with one and the same incident; but it is still stronger to consider such a striking occurrence as merely accidental, even when it is announced with complete certainty by its author before it took place, as was the death of Sapphira according to the 9th verse. If even supernaturalists<sup>2</sup> have nevertheless welcomed these assumptions, it can only prove how difficult it is for the mode of thought of our age to accommodate itself to a fact such as the one here related. But if they wish simultaneously to uphold the miraculous character and the divine purpose of the incident, it is a half measure which, after Baur's exhaustive discussion on the subject, it would be mere waste of words to refute. If it is impossible to

<sup>1</sup> On this, comp. *Baur*, *Paulus*, pp. 31 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Such as *Olshausen* on this passage. *Neander*, p. 40 ff. *Baumgarten*, 1. 100.

acquiesce in the miracle as it is here related, nothing remains but completely to surrender the truth of the narrative before us; and, though it is certainly difficult to believe that it should have arisen, merely from a dogmatic point of view, in a purely mythical way, and if we are therefore necessarily inclined<sup>1</sup> to assume some basis of fact as its germ, no further details can be elicited as to the true state of the case.

#### 4. THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH AND THE JEWS; THE FIRST PERSECUTIONS.

The impression made by the appearance of the Apostles and the first apostolic community on their Jewish fellow-countrymen was, according to the Acts, extremely favourable. Their remarkable piety gained them general goodwill; but, owing to their higher character revealing itself especially in the miraculous power of the Apostles, this goodwill was transformed into respectful veneration, nay, into fear. These two traits are obvious in the description which closes the events of Pentecost (ii. 42 ff), and they are again repeated in the same way in v. 11 ff : ἐγένετο φόβος μέγας ἐπί πάντας τοὺς ἀκούοντας ταῦτα . . . ἦσαν ὅμοι θυμαδὸν ἄπαντες ἐν τῇ στοᾷ Σολομῶνος· τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν οὐδεὶς ἐτόλμα κολλᾶσθαι αὐτοῖς, ἀλλ' ἐμεγάλυνεν αὐτοὺς ὁ λαός.<sup>2</sup> How far this veneration was carried is best proved by the 26th verse of the same chapter, where the emissaries of the Sanhedrim do not venture to take the Apostles by force: ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ τὸν λαὸν, ἵνα μὴ λιθασθῶσιν; and iv. 21, where the Sanhedrim itself, from the same motives, scruple to offend the Apostles. Nevertheless,

<sup>1</sup> On this, see *Baur*, p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> *Baur* wants here (Paulus, p. 22) to restrict the ἄπαντες to the ἀπόστολοι previously named, so that the λοιποῖς who do not venture to associate themselves with them would comprise the mass of Christians, with the exception of the Apostles. But as in ii. 42, 44, 46, the permanent assemblage of *all* the believers, including the Apostles, is expressly marked, and as, moreover, this only corresponds with the nature of the thing, I prefer the ordinary explanation, according to which the ἄπαντες are all the Christians, the λοιποὶ, the non-Christians.

our book tells of two persecutions which befel the leaders of the infant Church, even before Stephen's opposition to the Jewish Temple-service led to a more decided rupture with Judaism. The history of these persecutions is, however, subject to such manifold suspicions, that we cannot avoid a closer investigation of them.

The first (iii. 1—4, 31), according to the account of our book, is occasioned by a miracle wrought upon a lame man by Peter and John. This man, lame from his birth, at the word of Peter instantaneously acquires the complete and sound use of his limbs. That it is here intended to relate a miracle, and an absolute one, cannot be subject to doubt. Even of the rationalistic commentators, the greater number<sup>1</sup> have admitted that a verdict of *non liquet* must be pronounced; for which, however, may rather be substituted the entire clearness of the supernatural effect. The exploded hypothesis that the lame man was merely an impostor needs no refutation. But herewith the very beginning of our narrative is convicted of an unhistorical character, whether some naturally explicable occurrence gave occasion to the miraculous story,<sup>2</sup> or whether, without any such occasion, it was formed by the belief in miracles of that age, and by analogy to kindred Gospel narratives<sup>3</sup> It is, therefore, scarcely necessary to point out the circumstance that not even the condition of faith on the part of the healed is connected

<sup>1</sup> For instance, *Heinrichs*, Exc. v. of his Commentary. *Kuinol* on the same passage.

<sup>2</sup> To think of such is rendered permissible by examples such as that mentioned by *Hume*, in *Strauss' Glaubenslehre*, I. 241 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Although our Gospels relate no cure of the lame with detailed circumstances, so much the more marked, on the other hand, does the *χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν* in general appear. See Luke vii. 22, par. Matt. xvi. 31. It was natural to specify this in an individual case, and thus to render the miracle more striking, that the subject of the cure was lame from his birth, and was known as such (according to iii. 2, 10, iv. 14, 16, 21 f.) throughout the city. For the more elaborate delineation of the affair, a kindred incident, the healing of the paralytic, offered itself as a model (Luke v. 18 ff.); for, as it is said in v. 23, *ἔγειρε καὶ περιπάτει*, Peter (Acts iii. 6) employs the same expressions.

with the cure.<sup>1</sup> The magic of the miracle is thereby exalted, but as we should, even on other grounds, have been obliged to declare it unhistorical, the point seems insignificant.

If we proceed to the transactions of the Sanhedrim, these also contain improbabilities. It may strike us at once that, according to iv. 5, not merely the ordinary, but an enlarged Sanhedrim, (Meyer on this passage) assemble for the interrogation of the Apostles, to which, besides the regular members resident in Jerusalem, others also are summoned from the remaining territory<sup>2</sup> Yet the expressions of the 5th verse, ἐγένετο δὲ συναχθῆναι, &c., also admit the interpretation that the assembling of the enlarged Sanhedrim coincided only by chance with the trial of the Apostles. It is only if our account betray incredibility and design in other respects, that we should have reason to suspect, in the splendour with which this meeting of the Sanhedrim is surrounded, the object of setting the courageous and victorious demeanour of the Apostles in a more conspicuous light.<sup>3</sup> Another circumstance is more suspicious. Among those summoned, our 6th verse names "Ανναν τὸν ἀρχιερέα καὶ Καιάφαν καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ ὅσους ἡσαν ἐκ γένους ἀρχιερατικοῦ. But, according to Josephus (Ant xviii 2), Annas had long since lost the dignity of High Priest, and for years his son-in-law,

<sup>1</sup> For what *Baumgarten*, i. 73, is pleased to relate of the gradually increasing receptivity of the beggar, is pure fancy. Our book makes but one observation on his state of mind, which certainly indicates a certain receptivity, but, unfortunately, not a receptivity of spiritual gifts ἐπεῖχεν αὐτοῖς προσδοκῶν τι παρ' αὐτῶν λαμβάνειν.

<sup>2</sup> This is implied by συνάγεσθαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. To take Εἰς = ἐν (*Kuinol* and others) will of course not do, but also the hypothesis of *Heinrichs*, *Meyer* and *Neander* (p. 69) that the supernumerary members came only from their country residences in the neighbourhood of the town, is contrary to the text, a συναχθῆναι εἰς Ἱερό can only be spoken of if the συναχθέντες had not their official residence in Jerusalem. Whether one or two chanced to live outside the city does not here come into consideration. For the remaining points, comp. *Baur*, p. 16.

<sup>3</sup> This conjecture is, of course, not refuted, but established, when it is maintained, as by *Baumgarten*, i. 85, that its authors overlook the deep interest which Luke must have felt in the event, and which he desired to rouse in his readers. Does *Baumgarten* not see then that it is on this very interest that the possibility of a fiction is founded by us?

Joseph, surnamed Caiaphas, had been in possession of it, after no less than three High Priests had been appointed and deposed again between the two. That Luke should not have known this, the commentators of course could not admit, so help is sought in the remark (Meyer on this passage) that Annas, as former High Priest, may perhaps have been called *ἀρχιερεὺς*, and that Caiaphas was so also Luke took for granted as well known. But this is known only to us, who are readers of Josephus, and by no means to the reader of the Acts who comes to the work without previous learning; and from the expressions here, he can only think that Annas was the acting High Priest, and that Caiaphas, like John and Alexander, belonged to the family of the High Priest; nay, we can even scarcely avoid ascribing this idea to the author, for it would be an unnatural mode of expression to put the former High Priest first, with the epithet *ἀρχιερεὺς*, and to leave the actual one to follow, without any such distinction, on a level with two others. We are all the more justified in doing this, as it is evident from Luke iii. 2 that the circumstances in question cannot have been accurately known to our author. Finally, as regards the course of procedure, Baur (p. 17) has justly considered our 13th and 14th verses remarkable. That the members of the Sanhedrim should now, for the first time, have discovered the relation in which the two Apostles stood to Jesus, is quite incredible after all that has been previously related, and yet the words *ἐπεγίνωσκόν τε*, &c., admit of no other interpretation. And striking enough, in spite of Neander's counter argument (p. 69), is also the impression made upon the assembly by the presence of the lame man who was healed. The trial of the Apostles could but refer to one of two things, either to the reality of the miracle or its cause; and those who wished to bring the Apostles to punishment must either have assumed that no miracle had taken place at all, or, if they admitted this, they must have declared the miracle to be of demoniacal origin. In the first case, the Apostles were punishable as deceivers; in the other, according to the prophetic

law of Moses (Deut. xiii.), as teachers of error.<sup>1</sup> Now, if the members of the Sanhedrim had entirely denied the miracle, the sight of the lame man would certainly have been embarrassing. Meanwhile, this hypothesis is excluded by our author himself. If all Jerusalem knew the man as lame from his mother's womb, surely the priests must also have known as such the beggar who sat daily at the gate of the Temple; and, similarly, if the whole city was aware of his cure (iv. 16), they too, being zealously busied with the inquiry concerning it, must have known it on the morrow of the occurrence; they moreover explicitly proclaim it, for the Apostles (iv. 7) are not interrogated whether the lame man was actually healed, but by what power he was healed;<sup>2</sup> the reality of the miracle is unreservedly assumed. How else could the Sanhedrim have summoned or even tolerated the healed man, whose mere presence must have stultified their accusation? And, if this be so, how could the mere sight of the healed man so utterly confound the judges that they were unable to say another word? What does it teach them that they had not previously known and acknowledged? Did his presence prove that the miracle wrought upon him in the name of Jesus was a divine operation, that Peter's assertion (iv. 11 f.) was true? Finally, how can it be supposed that the Sanhedrists should have delivered the open confession ὅτι γνωστὸν σημεῖον γέγονε δι' αὐτῶν οὐ δυνάμεθα ἀρνήσασθαι? For, after all that was said before, these words cannot be intended to express merely the *reality* of the miraculous healing, irrespectively of its divine or demoniacal origin, but must be meant to acknowledge, what the Sanhedrists had previously denied, that the Apostles had worked a miracle by divine aid. But how is it credible that the assembled Sanhedrists should have believed this from their standpoint, and, even if they had believed it, that they should have said so? Was it ever known that a jealous hierarchy

<sup>1</sup> Compare on this subject *Baumgarten*, 1. 86.

<sup>2</sup> The words of this verse, ἵν ποιὸς δυνάμει . ἐποίησατε τοῦτο ὑμεῖς, seem to refer back to Luke xx. 2, where Jesus is asked, ἵν ποιῷ ἔξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς.

should have so far forgotten its position as in a formal council to admit the divine right of its adversaries? And is it not most flagrantly contradicted by the prohibition of preaching which is forthwith related? For any one dishonourably to turn a deaf ear to the truth which forces itself upon him is certainly common enough; but to acknowledge another to be the instrument of God, and yet strive to suppress him, is contradicted by the nature of things and by general experience. Such things are sometimes attributed to each other by parties in the heat of conflict, but they do not occur in reality, not because they are too bad, but because they are too absurd.

To allude once more, in conclusion, to the scene which terminates the record of the first persecution of the Apostles, the thanksgiving of the community on their liberation (iv. 23 ff); the circumstance could not be of much importance, that the unrestrained outpouring of the heart should be spoken in common by a large number (v. 24). The author takes no forbidden liberty when he collects the concordant expressions of individuals into one common expression. Obviously unhistorical, however, is the occurrence which follows the prayer (v. 31): *καὶ δεηθέντων αὐτῶν ἐσαλεύθη ὁ τόπος, ἐν φῶ ἥσαν συνηγμένοι· καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν ἀπαντες πνεύματος ἀγίου.* The rationalistic hypothesis (Heinrichs, Kuinol), that this was merely a natural event, which accidentally coincided with the conclusion of the prayer, has every probability against it; and though we can certainly not acquiesce in the reality of the miracle which our author wishes to record, it is all the more natural to conjecture that pious legend, or a writer romancing in the same spirit, originated the miraculous story in order to express by the earthquake God's reception of the prayer. The shock of an earthquake was a favourable omen, a sign of the *præsentia numinis*, not only with the heathen, but also with the Jews. Of the former, we will only recall Virgil, *AEn.* iii. 89 (*Da pater augurium, atque animis illabere nostris. Vix ea fatus eram, tremere omnia visa repente, &c.*); Ovid, *Metam.* xvi. 672; and other passages which com-

mentators adduce with reference to ours ; of the latter, Jes. vi. 4, and the rabbinical maxims quoted by Schottgen in connection with this passage.

The second intervention of the Jewish authorities against the Apostles is also occasioned by the miraculous agency of the latter, only this time it is not one particular miracle which presents the handle, but the narrative confines itself to a general description (v. 12—16) of the miraculous cures of the Apostles (v. 17): Ἀναστὰς δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς . ἐπλήσθησαν ζύλουν καὶ ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀποστόλουν All the Apostles are imprisoned, but in the night an angel liberates them , and, after they have again been brought before the Sanhedrim on the following morning, and have answered for themselves as before, they are dismissed, by the advice of Gamaliel, with a disciplinary castigation and a reiterated prohibition of preaching. In this narrative we are at once struck by the similarity of procedure to that of the first persecution. Here again the miracles of the Apostles are the cause of arrest, again an arrest in the Temple (v. 26); again the prisoners spend the night in the dungeon; again, the next morning, not a simple assembly of the Sanhedrim,<sup>1</sup> but one as complete as possible; again a threatening examination, which, however, ends only in the dismissal of the accused, with a fruitless interdiction. The only difference is, as Baur, p. 18, justly remarks, that in this second part everything is projected on a higher standard. The occasion is not a single miracle, but a whole mass of miracles; the arrest falls on all the Apostles, instead of on Peter and John; the danger becomes more urgent; the Sanhedrists consult about the execution of the accused, and dismiss them no longer with a mere threat, as in iv. 21, but with an actual, although comparatively slight, chastisement. Similarly the divine aid appears more conspicuously; an angel liberates the prisoners; and, when they have voluntarily re-committed

<sup>1</sup> Comp. with v. 21, συνεκάλεσαν τὸ συνέδριον καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γερουσίαν τῶν νιῶν Ἰσραὴλ ; iv. 5, συναχθῆναι αὐτῶν τὸν ἄρχοντας καὶ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ γραμματεῖς εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ.

themselves, the first theological authority of Judaism at that period rises to advocate tolerance in their behalf. This relation of the narrative to its predecessor is not quite favourable to its credibility : " If one cannot even perceive any natural procedure and connection in what has occurred but once," observes Baur, " how great is the improbability where the same incident, as it were outbidding itself, is supposed to occur a second time." We can but acquiesce in this opinion.

But our account is also in itself full of improbabilities. These include, first of all, the miracle by which (v. 19) the Apostles are liberated from prison. If the interposition of angels in the course of the history is of itself a sure sign of the mythical, this interposition is, moreover, quite objectless in the present case, for those who were liberated by the angel are nevertheless arrested again.<sup>1</sup> To this must be added that, in the later transactions before the Sanhedrim, not the slightest notice is taken of the miraculous liberation ; that neither do the accused appeal to this conspicuous voucher of divine favour, nor do the judges investigate such a striking and suspicious circumstance—certainly an unexampled proceeding if the thing actually occurred. But to take refuge on that account with the older rationalistic commentators in the natural interpretation, to suppose the prisoners to be liberated by lightning or an earthquake, or by a secret ally, with the assistance of the gaoler, is, of course (even on account of v. 23), as little possible as, with Neander (p. 726), to deny our record the necessary distinctness, accuracy and graphic power, and to maintain only the liberation by a divine providence unknown to us. The record is distinct and graphic enough : " The angel of the Lord opened the prison doors, and brought them forth and spake to them ;" more distinctly and graphically it is impossible to express oneself ; and it will be not graphic only to those who are unable to picture to themselves the appearance of an angel because they do not believe in angels.

<sup>1</sup> What Baumgarten remarks (i. 107 f.) in opposition to this is too extravagant for us, and may for the present be left to itself.

What distinguishes Neander's from the rationalistic view is only its incompleteness and vagueness; if we attempt to develope it into a more definite conception, it leads us back either to the incredibility of the miracle or to the perversion of the text by the natural interpretation. Herewith it does not remove, any more than the latter, the objection that in the further transactions before the Sanhedrim not a word is said of the supposed liberation. Thus, from whichever side we look at the matter, we can only return to its incredibility and improbability.

If we abandon this unhistorical, and moreover useless liberation, to investigate the historical causes to which the Apostles were indebted for their rescue, our record refers us to the well-known advice of the revered Pharisaic teacher, Gamaliel, which is connected with the whole position of the Jewish parties with respect to Christianity by the observation (v 17) that the persecution proceeded from the Sadducees. Meanwhile, this incident, in spite of its historical aspect, is by no means so certain as is usually assumed. In the first place, it is evident that the words attributed to Gamaliel by our text cannot possibly have been uttered by him exactly as we read them here. This is incontrovertibly shown by the mention of Theudas, v. 36. "Before these days," Gamaliel here says, "rose up Theudas," &c.; "after this man Judas the Galilean, in the day of the (Quirinus's) taxing." Now authentic history certainly knows a Theudas who, according to Jos., Ant. xx 5, 1, gave himself out for a prophet and persuaded a great multitude to migrate across the Jordan with bag and baggage, but who was attacked by the troops of the Procurator Cuspius Fadus, and, after considerable bloodshed among his adherents, was taken prisoner and beheaded. But this Theudas not only did not rise before the rebellion of Judas and the census of Quirinus, but appeared even later than the time at which the transactions of the Sanhedrim here related must have taken place, during the reign of Claudius (41—54 A.D.), and undoubtedly in its later years, as Josephus immediately connects with the mention of it, the story

of the recall of Fadus. Therefore of *this* Theudas Gamaliel cannot have spoken; for if some of the ancients wished to hold Josephus in the wrong, as against the Acts, this was an expedient as desperate as when others postponed our transaction to the time of Claudius, and translated the *μετὰ τοῦτον* of verse 37 as *more-over*. The general run of Harmonists therefore assume that the Theudas of our passage was different from the Theudas of Josephus—that the former played his part under Herod the Great, the latter under Claudius. Now it would be a peculiar coincidence if two men of the same name should have made themselves known within an interval of about fifty years as leaders of an insurrection, especially as the name of Theudas does not seem to have been so very common among the Jews.<sup>1</sup> Still we might allow such a play of chance to pass, as it is not quite without example, or we might also explain it by the conjecture of some older commentator,<sup>2</sup> that the younger Theudas was the grandson of the older, who bore the name of his grandfather, and renewed his enterprize. Only we are not here dealing with a mere repetition of the name, but with a repetition of the whole occurrence. What our book says of Theudas accords so entirely with the narrative of Josephus, that most of its features are completely identical; the remainder easily fit into each other, and on no point are actually contradictory.<sup>3</sup> The name of the insurgent

<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr., on this passage, can name out of the Talmud two others; Wetstein, on the passage, three or four others from Jewish or classical literature, who, like the fabulous disciple of Paul among the Valentinians, might be increased by a few more.

<sup>2</sup> See Poole's Synopsis on the same passage.

<sup>3</sup> Here is the proof

Acts Θευδᾶς λέγων είναι τινα ἑαυτὸν, φρόσεικάθη ἀριθμός ἀνδρῶν ὡσεὶ τετρακοσίων ὃς ἀνγρέθη καὶ πάντες ὅσοι ἐπειδούτο αὐτῷ διελέθησαν καὶ ἤγενοντο εἰς οὐδέν.

Jos. Φάδου τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐπιτροπεύοντος γόνης τις ἀνήρ, Θευδᾶς ὄνοματι, πειθεῖ τὸν πλεῖστον δχλον, ἀναλαβόντα τὰς κτήσεις ἐπισθαι πρὸς τὸν Ἰορδάνην ποταμὸν αὐτῷ. Προφήτης γάρ ἔλεγεν εἶναι, καὶ προστάγματι τὸν ποταμὸν σχίσας δίοδον ἐφη παρέξειν αὐτοῖς ῥάβδαν καὶ ταῦτα λέγων πολλοὺς ἡπάτησιν. οὐ μὴν εἴασεν αὐτοὺς τῆς ἀφροσίνης ὀνισθαι Φάδος, ἀλλ' ἐξέπεμψεν.

is the same in both records; according to both, his character is that of a pretended prophet or Messiah;<sup>1</sup> the number of his adherents, estimated in the Acts at 400, appears indeed somewhat greater in Josephus, but yet it could be overpowered in a sudden attack by a single squadron of cavalry (the ἵλη consisted of 128 men), and at any rate such estimates are always uncertain; finally, the result is, according to both, the execution of Theudas and the wreck of his enterprize; and if the Acts says more briefly that his followers were dispersed, while Josephus more distinctly specifies the slain and the captured, they are not incompatible; part will have been cut down or taken prisoners, the majority dispersed; this we must at any rate have conjectured from the more detailed circumstances of the assault as related by Josephus. When two records correspond in this manner, and vary from each other only in the statement of time, the difference of the incidents of which they treat must be incontrovertibly attested if we are to be justified in assuming actually different events, and not merely a mistake in the date. At least we may look in vain for an instance in which two authenticated accounts of different incidents stand in such a relation to each other as Luke's record of Theudas and Josephus's. In the case before us, neither of our two witnesses mentions two insurgents of the name of Theudas, but each one only: that there were two is assumed merely from the discordance of their dates. It is evident that this conclusion can lay claim to certainty and probability only if the reliability of the two narrators, and especially their knowledge of subsequent Jewish history and reckoning of time, leave no room for doubt. Now with regard to Josephus, we have every reason for trusting his statements in this matter;

εν ὅλην ιππέων ἐπ' αὐτοὺς, ἢ τις ἀπροσδόκητος ιππεοῦσα πολλοὺς μὲν ἀνεῖλε πολλοὺς δὲ ζῶντας ἔλαβεν· αὐτόν τε τὸν Θευδᾶν ζωγρήσαντες ἀποτέμνουσι τὴν κεφαλήν.

<sup>1</sup> Thus the words, λέγων εἰναι τινα ἁυτὸν, are explained not by Josephus only, but likewise by the Acts, viii 9, and by the comparison of the Apostle with Theudas.

while the author of the Acts, on the contrary, not only gives no pledge of the unqualified accuracy of his, but we have already had sufficient opportunity to assure ourselves of his manifold untrustworthiness; in the further course of this inquiry it will be confirmed yet more; and if we may even now be allowed to assume his identity with the author of the Gospel, the census of Quirinus gives incontrovertible evidence of what we may expect of his chronological accuracy. Under such circumstances, it ought indeed to be useless to waste another word in showing that one and the same fact is the basis of the two records, and that one of the two, that of the Acts, has misplaced it.

But if this proof should, nevertheless, require confirmation, it would receive it in the reflection, how unlikely it is that Josephus should have passed by the older Theudas, if such there was, in complete silence. An author who shows himself so accurately instructed as to the attempts at insurrection after the time of the first Herod, and who also conscientiously notes far more insignificant events, would certainly have alluded to an agitator still generally known after so long an interval. But vain are the endeavours, among the rebels known to Josephus, to find one corresponding to the description of the Acts. Sonntag<sup>1</sup> seeks our Theudas in the Simon who, according to Josephus (Ant. xvii. 10, 6; B. J. ii. 4, 2), instigated a rebellion in the year of the death of Herod the Great, assuming that Simon was previously called Theudas. But even if this hypothesis were not as arbitrary as it is, the predatory proceedings of a pretender to the throne, like Simon, would be not nearly so suitable a parallel to the appearance of the Apostles as the enterprize of a man giving himself out for a prophet and worker of miracles, like the Theudas of Josephus. It is precisely a miracle which is the subject dealt with in the inquiry against the Apostles, and if the result decided against them, it would prove against them the very thing which Josephus says of his Theudas, that he was an impostor. Besides, Simon had an army of far more than 400

<sup>1</sup> Stud. und Krit. 1837, 3, 638 ff.

men, which could only be overcome by the combined troops of the Romans and of Herod in a long and sanguinary battle. Equally untenable is the conjecture of Wieseler,<sup>1</sup> that our Theudas was the scribe Matthias, who, shortly before the death of Herod, in conjunction with Judas the son of Sariphäus, incited about forty of his disciples to throw down the eagle which Herod had placed over the gate of the Temple, and for this, together with his comrades, paid the penalty of his life.<sup>2</sup> The name is here a smaller difficulty, as Θεοδᾶς might be translated by Θεόδοτος or Θευδᾶς; but, on the other hand, the affair seems to have been far more insignificant than the insurrection of our Theudas; and of all the traits mentioned by the Acts, not one is suited to it, not the λέγων εἶναι τινα ἑαυτὸν, not the following of 400 men, not the διελύθησαν. When, finally, Zuschlag<sup>3</sup> looks on the Theudas of the Acts as the same person with the Theudion who, according to Jos. Ant. xvii. 4, was implicated in a conspiracy against Herod the Great, he is nevertheless unable to apply the statements of the Acts to this Theudion, save with the help of the conjecture that he was probably concerned also in the insurrection which broke out in Idumæa after the death of Herod.<sup>4</sup> But this is an entirely hollow and arbitrary hypothesis; instead of which it would be far simpler to abide by the vague possibility of an unknown Theudas, as the supposed share of Theudion in the insurrection of Idumæa is not the least known to us; besides which, our Theudas is evidently not a mere associate, but the independent chief of an enterprize in which he takes the lead as a prophet, and his followers amount to about 400 men; while the Idumæan insurgents are given at 10,000. Finally, in all these hypotheses, it remains most striking that Josephus, in speaking of the older Theudas, should not have

<sup>1</sup> Synopsis of the Gospels, 103 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Jos. Ant. xvii. 6, 2 f.; B. J. i. 83, 2 f.

<sup>3</sup> Theudas, the leader of an insurrection raised in Palestine; Cassel, 1849.

<sup>4</sup> Jos. Ant. xvii. 10, 10; B. J. ii. 5, 8.

<sup>5</sup> Zuschlag's explanation of this circumstance, p. 24, can hardly suffice.

mentioned this, the name by which, as it appears from the Acts, he was best known, when he was almost obliged to do it, if only for the purpose of avoiding confusion with his younger namesake, and companion in misfortune. All attempts of this kind must therefore be reckoned as failures ; and can only serve to establish the opinion that our Lukian Theudas is to be distinguished from that of Josephus by the anachronism which the author has allowed himself in mentioning him.

If it is thus undeniable that our book attributes to Gamaliel (verse 36) words which he neither spoke nor could have spoken, we have no longer any right to assume that we have an essentially true report of the further contents of Gamaliel's speech.<sup>1</sup> That it is utterly unhistorical cannot indeed, as yet, be deduced from a single blunder ; it might still be possible that our author had an older and more correct report before him, and merely amplified it by verse 36. But it is equally possible that the whole speech originated with him ; for if an historian does not scruple to attribute to the persons concerned sayings which they never uttered, there is no reason to suppose that he will be more scrupulous about whole speeches than about single sentences. We must therefore, first of all, maintain the possibility that our author, after the fashion of ancient historians, freely invented Gamaliel's speech ; and it is a question how much of it belongs to history at all, and especially whether Gamaliel delivered the discourse in favour of the Christian cause (verse 38 f.).

That we have reason for this doubt will be shown when we contemplate the relation in which, in our two narratives, the Jewish parties appear with regard to the new Christian sect. Chap. iv. 1 names the Sadducees as the originator of the persecution. Similarly it says, v. 17 : ἀναστὰς δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ πάντες οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ, ἡ οὖσα αἵρεσις τῶν Σαδδουκαίων, ἐπλήσθησαν ξύλου. As the grounds of this hatred, it is stated in iv. 2 that the Sadducees were grieved, διὰ τὸ διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς τὸν λαὸν καὶ καταγγέλλειν ἐν τῷ

<sup>1</sup> Neander. p. 75. Meyer on the passage

*Ιησοῦν τὴν ἀνάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν.* It is, on the other hand, the Pharisee Gamaliel, the first authority of his party at that time, who by his intercession shields the Apostles from the threatened danger, and obtains the comparatively favourable decision of the Sanhedrim. But this state of affairs is by no means probable. A short time before, at the trial of Christ, it is precisely the Pharisees who, more than any others, effect his condemnation (Matt. xxvii. 62; comp. xii. 14, xxi. 45, xxii. 15); as the reforming polemics of Jesus were chiefly directed against that party. Similarly, after the execution of Stephen, it is a Pharisaeic zealot, a disciple of this same Gamaliel from whom according to our passage proceeded the counsel of toleration, who in the service of the chief Jewish authorities carries out the persecution of the Christians with the greatest vehemence both in Judæa and beyond its boundaries (Acts viii. 1, 4, ix. 1 f., 21, xxii. 5; Gal. i.<sup>1</sup> 13 f. and other passages). Immediately before and after our event, the Pharisees therefore appear as the chief opponents of the new Messiah and his followers. Now is it credible that in the interval the position of the two parties should have been quite reversed, the Sadducees the opponents, the Pharisees the protectors of the Christian sect? for to separate the demeanour of Gamaliel or of Saul from that of his party is forbidden by the high authority of the one and by the full powers officially confided to the other. It might perhaps be thought that after Jesus had fallen, the Pharisaeic hatred was appeased for the moment, that the obedience rendered to the law by the new community had tranquillized it, and that it was first re-awakened by Stephen's opposition to the service of the Temple and the Law.<sup>1</sup> But the nature of party conflicts renders this improbable. A powerful hierarchical party, mortally attacked by a daring reformer, resolutely threatened in principle and in existence, does not forgive so readily as, immediately after the death of their antagonist, to become the protector of the disciples who revere him as the Messiah. But this representation would

<sup>1</sup> So *Lechler*, p 199.

correspond with the design of our author as little as the others. The way in which he wishes the affair to be regarded is best shown by his assertion, v. 17, that the High Priest, who brought the Apostles before the judgment-seat, belonged to the party of the Sadducees. Neither Hannas nor Caiaphas can have been Sadducees; for in the trial of Christ both appear at the head of the Pharisaic party; that their family belonged to it, can also be seen in Josephus, Ant. xx. 9, 1, who, in alluding to the younger Ananus, a son of ours, mentions as something peculiar and as the explanation of his deeds of violence, that he had espoused the party of the Sadducees. But it is equally certain that in this passage our author makes Hannas a Sadducee. Ἀναστὰς δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς, he says, καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ, ἡ οὖσα αἵρεσις τῶν Σαδδουκαίων, ἐπλήσθησαν ζήλου. This very distinctly implies that it was exactly among the Sadducean party that his associates were to be found; if the author had wished to describe a merely temporary alliance, he could not possibly have expressed himself thus. It also follows from this that he cannot have contemplated any change in the attitude of parties with respect to Christianity. If the true state of affairs had been at all known to him, he would not make Hannas a Sadducee. His doing so is sufficient proof how little historical ground there is in his account. So much the more might it be imposed upon him by extraneous premises. In the first place, one may recognize the influence of later conditions. In later times especially the relations between the ruling Pharisaic party and the community at Jerusalem certainly appear to have been tolerably peaceable; while, according to Josephus, Ant. xx. 9, 1, it was exactly the Sadducees under the younger Hannas who effected the death of James the Just. It might be thought that these later conditions were erroneously transferred by our author to the first years after the death of Christ, and that the older Hannas, if reckoned among the Sadducees, was mistaken for his son of the same name. Nevertheless, as the mention of James in the passage from Josephus appears to be derived from a gloss, and Hegesippus, on the other

hand, in Eus. K. G. ii. 23, 4, represents the Pharisees as his chief persecutors, I should be reluctant to attach any importance to it. So much the more probable is the purely dogmatic motive of our account, pointed out by Baur, p. 34. We see also from xxiii. 6 ff. (comp. xxi. 20 ff., xxiv 15, xxv. 8) how anxious our book is to describe the question of the resurrection as the chief point of dispute between the Christians and their Jewish opponents; and, on the contrary, to leave in the background the question concerning the continued duration of the Mosaic dispensation; to subordinate the difference between Christianity and Judaism to that between Pharisaism and Sadduceeism, between believing and unbelieving Judaism; to make Christianity like Pharisaic orthodoxy, a fraction of soundly-believing Judaism, which, like the latter, is combated by the common antagonist, Sadduceeism. It is unmistakably the same point of view which also governs our account. The Christians being orthodox Jews, it can only be the apostates from true Judaism, i.e. the Sadducees, by whom they are persecuted; and the motive of this persecution can only be *that* doctrine, which, according to the representation of our author, constitutes the essentially distinctive one dividing orthodox from heterodox Judaism, the doctrine of the resurrection; those, on the contrary, who protect the persecuted party can only be looked for on the side which agrees with the Christians on this main point, and, in common with them, opposes the Sadducean unbelief, i.e. the Pharisaic side. Applied to the individual case, he who brings the Apostles to the judgment-seat must be a Sadducee; he who effects their release a Pharisee; and, of course most appropriately, the most revered and influential man of this party, a Gamaliel. Thus our account may be satisfactorily explained; but so much the more plainly does its unhistorical character come to light.

If now we subtract from our two narratives all that has shown itself to be incredible or improbable, the origin of the persecutions in the hatred of the Sadducean party, the miracles which are supposed to have occasioned them, the details of the transac-

tions of the Sanhedrim, the miraculous liberation of the Apostles by the angel, and their natural, but not therefore less improbable, liberation by means of Gamaliel, the miraculous concluding scene of the first narrative, only this is left as residue—that in the early days of the community at Jerusalem, at two different times, first Peter and John, then all the Apostles, were summoned before the Sanhedrim, but after a resolute defence,—the first time with a menace, the second with a disciplinary castigation,—they escaped. Here the two incidents approach so nearly, that the suspicion spontaneously obtrudes itself that they may be only different representations of the same incident; for that first Peter and John only, afterwards all the Apostles, come under examination; that on the last occasion the menace of the Sanhedrists proceeds to corporal punishment,—these are such unimportant differences, and are so fully explained by an exaggeration of the first delineation in the second, that they give no sufficient reason for accepting a two-fold persecution of the Apostles. Now if it is completely incredible that one and the same incident, with the same or similar accessory circumstances, should in reality have occurred twice in so short a time; and if, on the other hand, it is more common for tradition to record one and the same event in different aspects, and that later comers should regard the different representations of the same event as so many different events, we could only, as far as we have yet gone, conjecture that it so happened in our case; and that the historical basis of our narratives may be reduced to this, that not very long after the formation of the first church, the Apostles or some of them were summoned before the Jewish authorities and were again released without any more severe measures.

Meanwhile we must advance a step further. A persecution, similar to our two, but which affected Peter only, is recorded in the twelfth chapter of the book. After King Herod (Agrippa I. 37—44 A.D.) had beheaded the Apostle James, he also threw Peter into prison. The latter was, however, liberated in the night by an angel, and was able to fly from Jerusalem. Not

long after, Herod, while receiving in Cæsarea the deifying homage of the people, was smitten by an angel of the Lord and died, devoured by worms. This story also contains a good deal that is mythical. First of all, in what it propounds concerning the death of Herod Agrippa. The same event is also recorded by Josephus (Ant. xix. 8, 2). According to his account, the king went to Cæsarea to hold games in honour of the emperor. When on this occasion he appeared in brilliant apparel, he was greeted as a god by some of his court. This flattery he did not reject. But after a few minutes he saw a screech-owl sitting above him, the same bird which had before presaged his elevation to the throne, and the bad omen was instantly followed by violent pains in the stomach, from which he died in five days. We cannot indeed give unqualified preference to this record as compared with our own. Although Josephus may perhaps give a truer account of the occasion of Agrippa's ostentatious demeanour than our book, which in verse 20, scarcely in accordance with the position of a Roman vassal, allows him to make or threaten war against the Phœnicians ; the screech-owl of Josephus, on the contrary, looks even more mythical than the angel of the Lord mentioned in our book. This, being nothing outwardly perceptible, may very easily be put aside as a subjective pragmatical addition of the narrator ; while the prophetic appearance of the screech-owl is an objective fact, evidently of unhistorical origin, arising perhaps from the transmutation of the angel into an omen according to Roman taste. On the other hand, the account given by Josephus of the cause of Agrippa's death is undoubtedly nearer the truth than that in the Acts. To be eaten by worms, to which the latter attributes his death, does not occur in reality, for the *φθειρίασις* into which it has been converted is another thing ; but it is the same complaint by which, 2 Macc. ix. 2, Antiochus Epiphanes, that pattern of a godless prince, is supposed to have died,<sup>1</sup> to which, according to Jose-

<sup>1</sup> And, indeed, just like Agrippa, on account of his θυητὸν ὅντα ισόθεα φρονεῖν ὑπέρηφάνως.

phus (B. J. i. 33, 5; Ant. xvii. 6, 5), Herod the Great, so abhorred by the Pharisees, had likewise succumbed; and although in this very passage, 2 Macc., may appear the model of the statement of Josephus (the illness of Antiochus begins with pains in the body and ends with worms), it is nevertheless most likely that the speedy death of Agrippa, which we must at any rate preserve as historical, was occasioned by the malady named by Josephus, or by one like it, and that this mode of death, combined with the preceding self-exaltation of the prince, suggested the comparison with Antiochus Epiphanes and Herod the Great, from which the *σκωληκόβρωτος* of our passage first arose. If the last version belonged only to Christian tradition, its origin was probably assisted by the object of rendering the persecutor of the Christians a parallel to the more ancient religious persecutors most widely known and abhorred; and if they could be found among the persecutors of the Jews, this parallel would of course be so much the more suitable.<sup>1</sup>

It is more important that the liberation of Peter from the dungeon in the Acts has also a completely mythical motive, for it is here even less possible than in the fifth chapter to convert the angel who leads him forth into a human friend. Verses 6, 7, 10, are as if they were designed most emphatically to exclude such a possibility.<sup>2</sup> In other respects, the liberation is so magical, the miraculous element in it is so intentionally brought out, that it is difficult even for the supernaturalists to allow the text to be in the right in this case; and even a Neander (p. 183), without saying a syllable about the angel, only observes, that "meanwhile Peter was liberated from prison through the special providence of God." What the details of this providence consisted of, Baur has probably correctly discovered when he, p. 161 f., conjectures that the execution of James may not have been so popular as Agrippa had imagined, and that for this reason Peter was released in an unexpected manner. Should this conjecture

<sup>1</sup> Comp. with this, *Baur*, 160.

<sup>2</sup> As *Baur*, 163 f., shows with more detail.

appear too uncertain, we must entirely refrain from any more detailed definition of the mode and the motive of the liberation. One might perhaps be disposed to allow thus much of the narrative to stand, that the Apostle succeeded in effecting a nocturnal flight from the prison; only, as the way in which this is here related is completely unhistorical, and as the detailed circumstances of the imprisonment render the flight as improbable as possible, we might even thus be going too far. All that we can maintain as historical, is the general fact that Peter was arrested and released again in an unexpected manner. Not only have we no reason to entertain a doubt of this, but the hypothesis best explains the origin of our narrative, and also recommends itself by its connection with the mention of the execution of James, for this notice was not only in and of itself so entirely adapted for preservation in tradition, but it likewise displays in our book too little mythical decoration and design to allow us to consider it unhistorical.

If, therefore, there is every probability in favour of the fact that in later times an interference of the Jewish authorities with the leaders of the community of Jerusalem actually took place, it is possible that it also suggested the narratives of the 3rd, 4th and 5th chapters. As these appear, they are so interspersed with obviously unhistorical elements, that we can nowhere find a firm footing. We can only conjecture that they are founded on a historical groundwork of some kind. If we had only those two narratives, we should most naturally look for this groundwork in the period to which they themselves ascribe it, to the first years after the death of Jesus. If, on the other hand, we have discovered at a somewhat later date an actual fact which contains the whole of the residue, after the subtraction of the plainly unhistorical or improbable elements of our narratives, i. e. the arrest of the most revered of the Apostles, and his unexpected and, from a Christian standpoint, apparently miraculous liberation, we have no reason to search for any further foundation for them; for it is more pro-

bable by far that they are merely an echo of the event recorded in our 12th chapter. We here see this event, with the needful alterations, transferred to the primitive times of the community, and spun out into two narratives, which, however, on nearer examination, prove to be only different versions of one and the same. This hypothesis recommends itself especially by the comparison of the 5th chapter with the 12th. We have seen above that the two records of the liberation of the Apostles, that which attributes it to an angel and that which attributes it to the intercession of Gamaliel, render each other reciprocally superfluous. For this very reason it is impossible that both can have been constituents of the primitive narrative. Whoever released the Apostles by means of the angel cannot have done this originally with the intention of frustrating the object of the miracle by their immediate re-arrest; and conversely, to any one who adopted the liberation through Gamaliel, the release by the angel was superfluous, and he cannot independently have contributed this to the narrative, but at most, if he found it before him, he may have scrupled to expunge it. Now although of the two records, the one respecting Gamaliel seems much the more natural, it is nevertheless, without doubt, the more recent. For the liberation by the angel is so objectless in our narrative, nay, so disturbing, that it cannot well have been inserted by our author himself, but must have been adopted from an older record; whereas the part attributed to Gamaliel, and the whole attitude of the two chief parties towards Christianity which is combined with it, is so closely connected with the characteristic pragmatism of the Acts (as will be shown hereafter in greater detail), that we have every reason for ascribing such features to the author himself. And with this it most perfectly accords that the anachronism respecting Theudas, and the incorrect statement regarding the position of Hannas as High Priest, i. e. two of the data of these portions of the narrative, have their entirely corresponding parallels in the errors of the same author in the third Gospel (ii. 2, iii. 2). Now, if this is the case, and if the narra-

tive of the fifth chapter in its primitive form ran thus, "the Apostles were thrown into prison, but were liberated by an angel," it is evident that what had befallen Peter, according to c. xii., had therewith been merely extended to all the Apostles; and if the narrative of the third and fourth chapters again coincide with the fifth chapter as to their historical germ, we have in the twelfth chapter a sufficient explanation of the two earlier ones, and it becomes very doubtful whether before Stephen any hostile steps whatever were taken by the Jewish authorities against the Christian community.

---

## SECOND DIVISION.

## THE FORERUNNERS OF PAUL

## 1. STEPHEN.

The death of Stephen is uncontestedly the clearest point in the history of Christianity prior to Paul. With this event we find ourselves for the first time on undeniably historical ground. It would be guaranteed even by the one decisive fact caused by the persecution of Stephen, the conversion of Paul; if indeed any further proof of its reality were required for an event so visibly involved in the development of the Christian cause. Meanwhile, it must be investigated whether the matter of fact is throughout faithfully recorded in our book, or whether here too single unhistorical elements have intruded themselves. This inquiry concerns three points in particular—the accusation raised against Stephen, his vindictory address, and the detailed procedure at his condemnation and execution.

The accusation against Stephen, according to vi. 11 ff., relates to blasphemy against God and the Law. This crime he is sup-

posed to have committed by saying, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος οὗτος καταλύει τὸν τόπον τοῦτον καὶ δλλάξει τὰ ἔθη, ἢ παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν Μωϋσῆς. Our book, however, specifies the witnesses who accuse him of this speech as false witnesses (v. 13), and hereby denies that Stephen had uttered any such speech. Meanwhile, there are sundry indications in favour of the correctness of this deposition. In the first place, it is probable in itself that Stephen went beyond the original standpoint of the Jewish Christian apostles in attacking the continued validity of the Mosaic Law; at least on this hypothesis it is most easily explained that it was against him in particular the first persecution broke out on the side of the Pharisaic party, the zealots of the Law. Paul, moreover (Gal. i. 13 f), mentions his zeal for the Law of his fathers as the motive of his conduct against the Christians. And then, in the following vindictory address, no word of denial is given to the speech of which he is accused, but it is even essentially repeated, for the gist of the whole address tends to reproach the Jews with the hardness of heart with which they cleave to the worship of the Temple; nay, even the building of the Temple, according to Baur's pertinent remark,<sup>1</sup> vii. 47, is not indistinctly represented as a pollution of a divine worship essentially free, bound to no fixed spot and fettered by no inflexible externality. Could Stephen speak thus when obliged to defend himself if he was not really of opinion that the service of the Temple must cease in the true theocracy? And even if the speech of our seventh chapter should not have flowed thus verbally from his lips, does not this account involve the admission that an expression like the one quoted was not far removed from the character of Stephen? Another thing must be added. Nearly the same speech which is here attributed to Stephen is in Matt. xxvi. put into the mouth of Jesus himself. Those who do this are indeed similarly called *ψευδομάρτυρες*, but it nevertheless appears from John ii. 19 that a tradition must have existed which acknowledged that the speech was actually made;

<sup>1</sup> P. 46 f.

at least, in any other case, John would not have been compelled to neutralize the offence conveyed in it by a perversion so violent. Now, as it is far more likely that a Judaizing account declared the words of Christ which were repulsive to themselves to be false, than that the false witnesses should have invented for themselves a speech so characteristic, and, when rightly read, so pertinent, and that the fourth Evangelist, or its source, should have adopted it on such suspicious testimony, there is everything to recommend the hypothesis that Jesus really uttered this saying, or one of similar import.<sup>1</sup> So much the more easily could Stephen then say what is here ascribed to him, that Jesus on his return would fulfil his promise, and that in the future kingdom of the Messiah the Law and the service of the Temple should be done away. These reasons have appeared sufficiently important, even to Neander,<sup>2</sup> to induce him to admit that what the false witnesses said cannot have been entirely invention, that Stephen certainly appears at least to have intimated that in the course of time the whole of external Judaism would fall to the ground, with the Temple at Jerusalem. Such, however, is not the opinion of our book, which in this case would have no reason for designating the witnesses as false; for, of what Neander observes in justification of this predicate, "these people may have accused Stephen of attacking the divinity and sanctity of the Law and of maligning Moses;" of all this, their deposition respecting the fact, their evidence of what Stephen was supposed to have said, does not contain a word. And when Baumgarten holds that the witnesses had wrenched Stephen's sayings from their proper context, and had thus given them an offensive character, no context can be imagined in which the announcement of a kingdom of God without a Temple, and an approaching destruction of the national sanctuary, could have appeared as anything but blasphemy to the Pharisees.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *Strauss*, L. J. 3 Part ii. 348 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Above work, p. 86. Comp. *Baur*, p. 56. Even *Thiersch*, Hist. of the Christian Church, &c., i. 84, and *Baumgarten*, i. 23, are forced to admit this in the main.

The vindictory address of Stephen, the detailed analysis of which must be sought from the first discoverer<sup>1</sup> of its real object and relations, certainly differs in a very characteristic manner from all that preceded it, especially from the more or less Judaizing apologies of the Acts. While these, starting from the essential identity of Christianity and Mosaism, show the fulfilment in Christ of the Old Testament prophecies, Stephen pursues the contrary course, essentially admits the opposition of the new faith to the enduring service of the Temple, but, on the other hand, defends this position on the basis of Old Testament revelation. By this means his vindication at once becomes a counter accusation. Being reproached with contempt of the divine institutions, he endeavours to show that it is rather his enemies, who, by their stubborn adherence to outward forms, contravene the real will of God. For this purpose, the speaker reverts to the more ancient history of the people of Israel, he points out how the theocratic institutions were certainly prepared by the fates of the patriarchs (comp v. 5, 7, 15 f., and the *χρόνος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας*, v. 17), but also how, with their first actual introduction, notwithstanding their apparently divine origin, the ingratitude of the people, and their incapacity to comprehend the divine guidance, is strikingly shown in the first rejection of Moses, and in the subsequent falling off to idolatry. He considers that the same mode of thought adhered to the building of Solomon's Temple, and concludes from the whole that it is only a continuation of the previous obstinacy and hardness of heart, when the Jews despise Jesus as they had before despised Moses (v. 37, 52); and when, on the other hand, they prefer the house of God built by human hands, and its services, to the true worship of God, just as their fathers in the wilderness preferred the golden calf to the living God (v. 51). Taken thus, Stephen's

<sup>1</sup> *Baur*, *Paulus*, 42 ff., and, earlier, *De orat habitæ a Steph consilio*, 1829. The work of *Luger* on the object, purport and characteristics of Stephen's address (Lub. 1838) I know only by reports from a third hand; to the details of *Ebrard* (*Crit. of the Gospel Hist* 689), and of *Baumgarten* (i. 129 ff.), which appear to follow this work, I am indebted for few tenable particulars.

address certainly appears not only characteristic, but much better suited to the case, and to the accusation raised against him, than is usually supposed. Nevertheless, we must acquiesce in Baur's doubt as to its authenticity. For, in the first place, it is difficult to see how it was possible to preserve an accurate recollection of the words spoken by Stephen. A transcript<sup>1</sup> of course, from all we know of the customs of that time, it is impossible to think of; that Christians were present in the Sanhedrim who would carefully impress the speech of the martyr on their memory, and write it down immediately after his execution, cannot be supposed, owing to the procedure of this court, in which public transactions were unknown (comp. iv. 15, v. 34). Finally, that one of the Sanhedrists, perhaps a secret friend of the Christian cause, or it might be the Apostle Paul,<sup>2</sup> should have closely noted the words of the accused, and subsequently communicated them, is sufficiently improbable even in itself, but is doubly improbable in the case before us, in which the tumultuous nature of the whole transaction must have impeded the memory of individuals, while the most extreme attention would have been necessary to preserve details such as those in verses 7, 25, 37, 38,<sup>3</sup> 44, 46, f.,<sup>4</sup> which are most significantly but too subtly applied for their importance to become evident at the first glance, and even before the context of the whole is apprehended. Secondly, these very details, combined with the entire skilful plan of the address, prove such well-pondered elaboration as is scarcely possible in an extempore oration made in the midst of the greatest excitement. Finally, we can discover in it, both in import and language, an accordance with other Lukan

<sup>1</sup> As Heinrichs, Com. 385 f., and Riehm, De Font Act Apost. 195 f., suppose. This transcript Heinrichs is not disinclined to ascribe to Paul. Riehm conjectures the same more definitely.

<sup>2</sup> As Ebrard, p. 690, and Baumgarten, p. 129, conjecture, like Luger; comp. previous remark.

<sup>3</sup> λόγια ζῶντα, in contrast to the dead Levitical worship. Comp. the λατρεία λογική and the θνοῖα ζῶσσα, Rom. xii. 1.

<sup>4</sup> The contrast between σκῆνωμα and οἶκος, on which comp. Baur, p. 47.

passages which renders it very improbable that it should have been derived from Stephen as it now lies before us.<sup>1</sup> All these circumstances allow us to conjecture that the address in its present form is a more recent composition. Its historical foundation must be investigated later.

This conjecture is confirmed when we also find unhistorical features in the further record of our book concerning the trial of Stephen. Baur (p. 52 ff) has justly deemed it remarkable that the Jewish Sanhedrim, which was not allowed to execute any verdict of death without the consent of the Roman governor, utterly neglects this form in the case of Stephen—nay, even delivers the accused to execution without condemnation; and it is no less improbable that, amidst tumultuous proceedings, it should have been possible to make a speech of such import and length. Neander, on the contrary, remarks, p. 88 (comp. p. 94), “It can well be imagined that the fanatical Jews dragged Stephen before the Sanhedrim which had just assembled,”<sup>2</sup> and that here the effect of his divine aspect at first inspired feelings of veneration in a portion of the assembly, which, combined with the import of the commencement of his address, procured him a hearing, until at the words v. 51 ff. the fanatical fury broke forth, the blasphemer was thrust out from the assembly, and abandoned to popular justice. But does not this attempt to rescue it only display more strongly than ever the disconnectedness of our account, in which even Neander cannot avoid perceiving a want of “clear and graphic detail”? Can it be imagined that the very assembly, so alive to the awe-inspiring impression of the divine, which at first listened with all patience to such a lengthy vindication, should now at once so entirely

<sup>1</sup> The more detailed evidence of this will be given in the last division of this work, with the investigation respecting the authorities of the Acts.

<sup>2</sup> “Or,” adds Neander, “that the Sanhedrim assembled to inquire into this accusation; for we are not justified in assuming that all that is related in the Acts concerning Stephen occurred in one day.” But when it is said in vi. 12, ἐπιστάντες συνήρασαν αὐτὸν καὶ ἤγαγον εἰς τὸ συνέδριον, it is plain enough that there was not an interval of even a day between ἀγειν and this συναρπάζειν.

forget all forms as to indulge in proceedings such as these? Even if the passionate reproofs of Stephen elicited a tumultuous scene, a procedure such as is supposed by Neander is scarcely credible. The most natural course in this case would have been at once to pronounce sentence on the accused, perhaps in a somewhat irregular manner, by wild acclamation, and to provide for its speedy accomplishment; but not to thrust him from the hall and abandon him to lynch law. Such a procedure would have been without example even in the most intemperate tribunal. But our book does not really record it. The Sanhedrists here precipitate themselves all together (v. 57), *δμοθυμαδὸν*, upon Stephen, and drag him out to be stoned. Only so much the greater is the contrast between this sudden savage rage and the patience with which they had previously heard him, and so much the more improbable the whole proceeding. Neander's chief evidence in its favour is that Stephen's address bears the stamp of one actually delivered, and that this address presupposes a tribunal in presence of which it was delivered. This, indeed, is obvious; but just for that very reason the writer of our record has inserted a formal sitting of the judicature in the midst of the tumultuous proceeding, regardless whether it suited the rest of his account. He wanted to make Stephen give utterance to his principles before his death; but that he did not do so by any means in his own words we have already seen.

On several other points we must also side with Baur against Neander. Baur (p. 55) considers the statement, vi. 15, *ἀτενίσαντες εἰς αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ καθεζόμενοι ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ εἶδον τό πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ πρόσωπον ἀγγέλου*, as the transformation of a subjective Christian opinion into an objective phenomenon. Neander, on the contrary (p. 89), thinks that this observation contains either the evidence of some members of the Sanhedrim as to the impression made on them by Stephen, or that the author transmitted in his own language the information which

he had received on the subject. Only when he says that to *all* the Sanhedrists his face appeared as the face of an angel, it is clear that he does not wish thereby to portray merely an “awe-inspiring impression,” but an objective and indeed an extraordinary phenomenon. This impression might naturally be experienced by those who had a certain susceptibility for the greatness of Stephen, but we must of course not assume it in all, only in a very small minority of the members of the Sanhedrim. When Baur further doubts the two sayings of Stephen, verse 59 f., κύριε Ἰησοῦν δέξαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου, and κύριε μὴ στήσης αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀμαρτίαν ταύτην, on account of their resemblance to two sayings of Jesus preserved only by Luke,<sup>1</sup> it is a very insufficient rejoinder of Neander's (p. 95), that the Spirit of Christ, which expressed itself in these words of Christ, made Stephen express himself quite similarly. That this Spirit should have selected precedents solely from the Gospel of Luke would, however, be far too strange; and in case of doubt, it is certainly more natural to assume that the author, to whom this Gospel was assuredly well known, should have coincided with its sayings rather than Stephen to whom it was unknown. Baur's remark is strengthened by the observation that the immediate transfer of the righteous dead to heaven, as is assumed in verse 59, was in all probability foreign to the most ancient Christian conceptions, and was only recognized at a later time as a special privilege of the martyrs,<sup>2</sup> of which the series opens with Stephen. When Baur, therefore, considers that our account is influenced by the parallel of the dying Redeemer, he has every reason for that opinion; and when he suspects that the same parallel has affected the preceding scene of judgment, the resemblance of the accusations raised against Stephen and against

<sup>1</sup> Luke xxv. 34: πάτερ ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἰδασι τὶ ποιοῦσι. Verse 46: πάτερ εἰς χεῖράς σου παραθήσομαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου.

<sup>2</sup> On this comp. my treatise, *The Doctrine of the New Testament on the State after Death*, Tübingen Journal, vi. 390 ff.

Jesus, the *ψευδομάρτυρες*, the whole transaction before the Sanhedrim, affords sufficient ground for it.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. CHRISTIANITY IN SAMARIA; PHILIP; SIMON MAGUS; THE BAPTISM OF THE ETHIOPIAN.

With the execution of Stephen, according to vi. 1, a general and vehement persecution broke forth against the Christian community in Jerusalem, by which all its members, excepting the Apostles, were expelled from the city. This last, however, is not probable. For in the first place, as Schneckenburger<sup>2</sup> has strikingly shown, it is impossible to see what prevented measures from being taken against the Apostles, and also what should have detained them in the city;<sup>3</sup> and secondly, in ix. 26, a very short time after our incident,<sup>4</sup> the members of the Christian community (*οἱ μαθηταὶ*) re-appear in Jerusalem without anything of a return being mentioned of those who were dispersed. If, therefore, the Apostles remained here after the death of Stephen, which, according to Gal. i. 17, does not admit of doubt, it is the more improbable that all the other Christians abandoned this city; and as we cannot explain away this statement from our passage,<sup>5</sup> we can only consider it as an unhistorical

<sup>1</sup> Even the questions at the examination, Luke xxiii. 67 (*λέγοντες εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, εἰπὲ ἡμῖν*) and Acts vii. 1 (*εἶπε δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς· εἴ ἀρά ταῦτα οὐτως ἔχει*), are alike in expression at least. In Matt. xxvi. 63, the question of the High Priest runs, *τίνα ἡμῖν εἶπης, εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός.*

<sup>2</sup> Zweck der Apg. p. 182 f.

<sup>3</sup> Meyer, on this passage, thinks that the Apostles remained in order to continue in the centre of the theocracy; but what was the use of this if all their adherents were dispersed? In i. 4, 8, they already receive totally different instructions. It is here assumed that the Jews were afraid to lay hands on their persons; only, iv. 5, they are not afraid to arrest them; and the case with respect to v. 13, 26, we have already seen.

<sup>4</sup> Namely, according to the chronology of our book, for which we will give more details further on.

<sup>5</sup> As Baumgarten (i. 158 f.) does by the hypothesis that the Christians were attacked in an assembly of the community, and that *from this assembly* all present were expelled; but, on the other hand, a large portion of them, and especially the

hyperbole, and assent to Schneckenburger's remark, that the persecutions probably fell only on the Hellenistic believers connected with Stephen, as only such (xi. 20) appear among the fugitives. Whether the author had any particular reason for this hyperbole, whether he intends by the dispersion of all its members to conclude the history of the community at Jerusalem, which henceforth loses its independent importance in our account, may be left open for the present. But that the Apostles do not fly with the rest, conduces to the glorification of their courageous faith, though, at the same time, this feature, historical as it is, was far too indispensable, even on account of viii. 5 ff., ix. 27, to oblige us to search for any particular explanation of it.

A result of the dispersion of the community at Jerusalem was the extension of Christianity throughout the rural districts of Judaea and in Samaria. Our 8th chapter names Philip as its first promulgator in this country; while according to xxi. 8 and viii. 14, he did not belong to the Apostles, but to the seven deacons mentioned in the 6th chapter. The Ephesian Bishop Polycrates, in Eus. H. E. iii. 31, 2, v. 24, 1, calls him one of the twelve Apostles. That the same person is meant in both passages cannot be doubted,<sup>1</sup> if only because Polycrates, like our 21st chapter, mentions Philip's soothsaying daughters,<sup>2</sup> concerning whom it is a somewhat trivial difference that our author gives him four daughters and ascribes the gift of prophecy to all of them; the other, on the contrary, knows of only two daughters, of whom but one was so endowed. But that for this reason the Apostle and the deacon may really have been the same person, as Weizel insists,<sup>3</sup> no one will believe who has

Apostles, remained in Jerusalem. Baumgarten terms this, "to adopt a pregnant style of expression." It is of course understood that a word of refutation would be wasted on such monstrous exegesis.

<sup>1</sup> Which De Wette, on the passage, seems to call in question.

<sup>2</sup> For there is little to recommend Gieseler's conjecture, Stud. und Krit., 1829, 139 f., that c. xxi. 9 is a later gloss.

<sup>3</sup> Die Christl. Passahfeier, p. 153.

made himself acquainted with the relative positions of the two offices as they are represented in our book: the deacons are selected, according to vi. 2, just because the Apostles cannot undertake the distribution of alms; and conversely in our paragraph Peter and John are obliged to come from Jerusalem because only an Apostle is able to impart the final consecration. Therefore, if Philip was one of the twelve Apostles, he was not one of the seven deacons, and vice versa; so much is certain. Here the statement of our book is favoured by the consideration that there would be far fewer conceivable grounds for the degradation of the Apostle to the diaconate in our account, than for the exaltation of the deacon to the Apostleship in the tradition of a Church to which the honour of an apostolic origin thereby accrued; while, at the same time, the less precise use of the apostolic title to indicate distinguished promulgators of the Gospel not belonging to the twelve, such as Barnabas, might easily occasion the transfer of the *εὐαγγελιστὴς* (as Philip is termed in c. xxi.) to the college of Apostles. To this it must be added, that our book occupies a position considerably nearer to the time of Philip than the Epistle of Polycrates (198 A.D.); and that xxi. 8, 9 (more on the point later), appears to be derived from the report of an eye-witness. On the other hand, just the words, *δύντος ἐκ τῶν ἐπτὰ*, in the last passage, with their obvious reference to c. vi., seem to betray themselves as an addition of the author, whose identity with the above-mentioned eye-witness further inquiry will oblige us to dispute; and the accuracy of Polycrates' statements respecting the daughters of Philip awakens a prejudice in favour of the tradition whence it proceeds. Meanwhile, however, no sufficient motive can be shown for our author or his authorities attributing to the Apostle the subordinate part of a deacon; for that he should have done so in order to detract nothing from his statement in viii. 1 respecting the continued sojourn of the Apostles in Jerusalem, is not probable, since it was no more inconsistent with this for Philip to make a missionary journey to Samaria than for Peter and John, and as

from his whole tendency a further apostolic prelude to the conversion of the Gentiles could only be desirable. It might be more easily credited that he transformed Philip into a mere deacon to bring Peter in contact with Simon Magus, in the manner related in verses 14 ff.; but for this also much easier means were at his command, since he might have made Peter go to Samaria independently of Philip, as in ix. 32. On this point, therefore, the correctness of our account has the preponderance of probability in its favour.

We shall be obliged to judge less favourably respecting the credibility of the narrative, verses 6—8 and verses 14—17. Philip, it is said in the first passage, came to a city of Samaria; and here, in consequence of the miraculous cures which he wrought on those possessed, the palsied and the lame, he gained for his preaching the attention of the whole people. That these cures were effected in a natural manner, that not only the expulsion of devils, that is, real or supposed cures of lunatics of this species, succeeded in consequence of purely psychical impressions; but that many lamed or otherwise affected by paralysis, were each and all made whole, and could be made whole in the same way, no one will think credible. Here, then, at all events, we have an unhistorical portraiture of Philip's doings in Samaria. To question his labours there is of course no more justified by this circumstance than the mediæval missionary legends entitle us to doubt the historical importance of a Boniface or an Ansgar; but it nevertheless proves that fiction was busy in this narrative also, and that it is not pure history we have before us.

We see the same from verses 14 ff. According to this account, none of the Samaritans baptized by Philip received the Holy Ghost; it is only when the Apostles Peter and John pray for it on their behalf, and impart to them the imposition of hands, that it descends upon them. Such a proceeding is certainly extremely strange. It is plainly founded on the idea that the Apostles only, and not the deacons, were empowered to impart

the Holy Spirit, and that this gift did not in any way result from the stronger impression of the apostolic preaching, 'but singly and solely by prayer and imposition of hands. Such a magical effect of these actions, and a privilege so exclusively connected with the apostolic office, cannot belong to historic truth, but only to the ideas of a period which had lost a correct view of the Apostle's position, and of the nature of the gift of the Spirit. Apologetic history itself scarcely ventures to deny this, but only the more zealously does it endeavour to emancipate our author from these conceptions by the interposition of natural, psychical explanations. The Samaritans, observes Neander, p 104, and similarly Meyer on this passage, at first received the baptism of water without the baptism of the Spirit. The cause of this consists in the way in which they arrived at the faith. Their vague craving for higher revelations, turned aside from its true aim by the deceptive arts of Simon Magus, led them, at the sight of the miracles wrought by Philip, first to a merely outward faith proceeding from sensuous impressions; and it was only by the teaching and prayer of the two Apostles that the true Spirit and their own inward experience of Christian doctrine was laid open to them; and consequently they now, for the first time, were empowered to receive the gift of the Spirit. But this apostolic instruction, the "preparation" for the consecration of the Spirit, which Neander here introduces, our text totally ignores; as it likewise ignores the defective nature of the original faith of the Samaritans first awakened by Philip. When it is rather the preaching of Philip and the unanimous attention of the people to this preaching that are mentioned (verses 5 f. and 12), while the bestowal of the Spirit, on the contrary (verses 14 ff), seems to be effected simply and solely by prayer and imposition of hands by the Apostles, it becomes evident that our book represents the case as being the very reverse, that here it is exactly Philip who, in addition to the external means of miracles, employs also the spiritual medium of instruction; whereas the Apostles, by purely external

means, their wonder-working imposition of hands, produce an effect possible according to our ideas only in a spiritual manner. Therefore, if we cannot persuade ourselves of the possibility of this incident, it is better unreservedly to acknowledge our doubt as to the narrative before us, than, with the modern apologetics, to alter its meaning by unauthorized additions.

From its connection with what we have discussed above, the narrative of the 8th chapter concerning Simon Magus and his meeting with Peter becomes suspicious. For as, according to our book, the essential object of Peter's presence in Samaria is the apostolic communication of the Spirit to those whom Philip had baptized, it is a question whether, with the motive, the presence also is to be surrendered; and as the scene between Simon and Peter likewise turns on this communication of the Spirit, and with the statement of the 18th verse that the Spirit is imparted by means of the apostolic imposition of hands, loses its special object, since it is this very apostolic privilege which is here concerned; so not only does the outward occasion of this scene disappear, but its whole meaning falls away, if the privilege did not exist in the manner adopted by our account; and it cannot be assumed without further ceremony that some other analogous incident afforded a basis for the narrative before us. But besides, various objections may be offered against the historical existence of our magician. This man, it is well known, plays the first part in the ancient legends of heresy. But even the earliest statements respecting him sound so apocryphal, that they make him appear a thoroughly mythical character. According to Justin, Apol. i. 26, 56, he was a native of the Samaritan village Gitton, went to Rome under Claudius, and was enabled by his magical arts to raise himself to such reputation, that the Roman Senate decreed him divine honours and the famous statue, re-discovered in the sixteenth century on the island in the Tiber, the inscription of which the worthy father had certainly read very incorrectly when he converts *Semo Sancus*, the Roman Hercules, into a *Simo Sanctus*. Irenæus (i. 23, 2, 27, 4; ii. pref.; iii. pref.)

terms him the father of all heretics. In the same character of representative of heretical Gnosticism, the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions constitute him the standing antagonist of Peter, who, wandering from the East to Rome, endeavours to gain adherents for his polytheistic heresy by means of magic arts and exhortations; and the Apostolic Constitutions (vi. 9), with many others,<sup>1</sup> make him while in Rome fly into the air by magic arts, whence he is again precipitated at the prayer of Peter; while, according to Hippolytus, Philosoph. vi. 20, he allows himself to be buried alive at Rome, saying that he should rise again on the third day. Hegesippus<sup>2</sup> is also acquainted with a sect of Simonians. Justin further states (Apol. i. 26, Tr. 120, Schl.), that in Samaria almost universally, beyond Samaria, on the contrary, by few only, Simon was acknowledged and honoured as the Supreme God, exalted above all angels (*ἀρχαὶ, ἔξουσίαι, δυνάμεις*); and, together with him, a certain Helena, formerly a courtesan who had gone about with him, was given out as the *πρώτη ἑννοια ἀπ' αὐτοῦ γενομένη*. The Clementine Homilies are able to record not merely further details (ii. 22 ff.) of the life and miracles of the magician, but also of his doctrines. According to their statements, he gave himself out as the Supreme Power, from which he distinguished the Creator of the world as a subordinate Being; and at the same time he is supposed to have called himself the ‘*Ἐστὼς*, to signify that he was the *Messiah*.<sup>3</sup> He is, moreover, reproached with having denied the resurrection of the dead, and believed in a future judgment only apparently, that he attempted to put Mount Gerizim in the place of Jerusalem, and that he perverted the meaning of the Old

<sup>1</sup> Cotelier, on this passage, in the Ap. Const. *Simon*, in Illgen's Periodical of Hist. Theol. 1841, 3, 31 ff. Moreover, it is only later statements that say that Simon on this occasion fell dead; the Ap. Const. and a part of their successors only make him break his legs.

<sup>2</sup> In Eus. iv. 22, 5: Θέβουνθις . . . ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπτὰ αἱρέσεων ὡν . . . ἀφ' ὧν Σίμων, ὅφεν οἱ Συμμανοὶ, καὶ Κλεόβιος . . . καὶ Δοσιθεος, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Work cited, 22: ἐνίστε δὲ καὶ Χριστὸν ἵαντὸν αἰνιστόμενος ἐστῶτα προσαγορεύει. ταύτη δὲ τῇ προσηγορίᾳ κέχρονται ὡς δὴ στησόμενος δεῖ καὶ αἰτιαν φθορᾶς, ὥστε τὸ σῶμα πεσεῖν, οὐκ ἰχων.

Testament (*τὰ τοῦ νόμου*) by means of allegorical interpretations. It is here related of his first appearance that he was originally an adherent of John the Baptist, and occupied the first place among his thirty chosen disciples ; while he was in Egypt, to learn magic, John was killed, and Dositheus was chosen as his successor ; however, after his return, Simon contrived, with the aid of his magic arts, to upset Dositheus and to put himself in his place. He now associated with himself Helena, who had also belonged to the thirty,<sup>1</sup> and wandered about with her, asserting her to be the all-productive Truth and Wisdom (*παρμήτορα οὐσίαν καὶ σοφίαν*), who had descended to earth from the highest heaven. It was a phantom of this Helena about whom the Trojans and the Greeks had fought. Besides this, we learn all sorts of marvellous stories of miracles, some of which Simon actually performed, and others which he had to perform. We read the like in the Recognitions. According to the shorter statement, i. 72, Simon is said to have asserted : Se esse quendam Stanton, h. e. alio nomine Christum, et virtutem summam excelsi dei, qui sit supra conditorem mundi ; while at the same time he supported this assertion by numerous miracles. In the more detailed accounts, ii. 7 ff., iii. 47, his doctrine is given as follows : he declared himself to be the Supreme Power, exalted, without beginning or end, infinitely above the Creator of the world ; at the same time he called himself the Enduring, and wished to be regarded as the Messiah. That name is then explained as in the Homilies, with which also accords the further history of Simon's relation to Dositheus ; of Helena, or, as it is here translated, Luna ; and of Simon's miracles and atrocities. It only lacks this, that Simon wanted to substitute the Samaritan for the Jewish worship, and that he allegorized the Old Testament. Neither is there any mention of

<sup>1</sup> Her reception among them was explained in ch. xiii. as follows : as the twelve Apostles correspond to the twelve months of the sun's course, so the thirty disciples of John answer to the thirty days of the moon's course ; but to indicate that it is in reality only twenty-nine and a half days, a woman corresponding to half a man was included among them

his contradicting the doctrine of the resurrection; on the other hand, he is, in i. 57, evidently on account of this assertion, made the founder of the sect of the Sadducees, in conjunction with Dositheus. This description, then, differs in nothing essential from that of the Homilies; and the contradiction which it has been attempted to find in the Recognitions, between i. 72 and ii. 7, that Simon in the former gave himself out only as a power of God, in the latter as the Supreme God himself,<sup>1</sup> scarcely exists in reality, for the *virtus summa excelsi dei* can very well be considered as substantially identical with the Supreme God, inasmuch as it describes this God only as he is revealed, like the *Meinra* of the Targums.<sup>2</sup> To these descriptions, Irenæus, i. 23, adds several further features, which Tertullian, *De. An. c. 34*, also transcribes. According to him, Simon maintains, *semetipsum esse, qui inter Judæos quidem quasi filius adparuerit, in Samaria autem quasi pater descenderit, in reliquis vero gentibus tanquam spiritus s adventaverit*. *Esse autem se sublimissimam virtutem, h. e eum qui sit super omnia pater, et sustinere vocari se quodcunque eum vocant homines*. Helena, originally a courtezan of Tyre, he declared to be the first idea (*mentis conceptio, ἐννοια*), by whom he determined to create the angels and archangels. By his adherents Simon was adored under the form of Jupiter, Helena under that of Minerva. Whereas Helena, or the primitive idea, sprang from the Father and descended to the lower regions, she brought forth, according to Simon's doctrine, the creative powers or angels; but out of jealousy she was restrained, and compelled by these to wander from one feminine body to another, and thus among others into that of the Greek Helen; she was the lost sheep of the Gospel, and to release her and to bless mankind by the knowledge of her, Simon appeared in a phantom-body. Whoever believed in

<sup>1</sup> *Ritschl*, on the Origin of the Anc. Cath. Church, 158. *Simon*, in Illgen's Periodical for Hist. Theol., 1841, 3, 66.

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps the expression, Rec. i. 72, may have been derived directly from the Acts, which we have already (p. 61 f.) found to be employed in this division of the Recognitions.

Simon and Helena need not trouble himself about good works, for by grace only was salvation possible, and no works exist which are good in themselves ; much more were moral precepts the mere arbitrary commands of the creating angels. The priests of this sect, therefore, as Irenæus adds, devote themselves to magic and all manner of lusts. Whence Irenæus derived this information, where it extends beyond the Clementine tradition, is perhaps told us by Hippolytus, *Philosoph.* vi. 7—20. This writer had before him a book nominally composed by Simon, under the title of *ἀπόφασις μεγάλη*, from which he gives somewhat detailed extracts. The cause of all things, according to this version of the Simonian doctrine, is the infinite power (*ἢ ἀπέρ-αντος δύναμις*), which is no other than fire. Regarded as the hidden ground of things, or as invisible fire, this power comprises in itself everything intelligible ; as visible fire it produces the world.<sup>1</sup> The first products of the original fire, the six roots of all things, are the three Syzygies, *νοῦς* and *ἐπίνοια*, *φωνὴ* and *ὄνομα*, *λογισμὸς* and *ἐνθύμησις*, of which the first is likewise termed heaven and earth, the second sun and moon, the third air and water. But the primitive essence which reveals itself in them and in all things is called in its uncreated power *ἔστως* ; so far as it produces the phenomenal world as its image, *στὰς* ; so far as it represents itself in the higher world, *στησόμενος*. In this doctrine of æons the seven days of creation in Genesis are typified, while to the three Syzygies the *Pneuma* is added as a seventh. The pretended Simon describes it as the image of the primitive power, originally comprised in it, but in whose nature it was to develope itself into the world ; so that it thus plays, as the *σύζυγος* of the primitive being, exactly the same part as the *πρώτη ἔννοια* according to the representation of Irenæus ; and Epiphanius, *Hær.* xxi. 2, also, without reserve, calls the *ἔννοια* the *πνεῦμα ἀγιον*. This highest Syzygy is again identified also

<sup>1</sup> The definition of the primitive being as fire, as well as the distinction of a double fire, is known to have belonged to the Stoical philosophy. Comp. my *Philosophy of the Greeks*, iii. 72 f.

with the first derived pair, *νοῦς* and *ἐπίνοια*, when it is said (c. 18) that the Father of all, hermaphrodite according to his infinite power, produced from himself the *ἐπίνοια*, and it thus became two : the *νοῦς* as the masculine part, the *μεγάλη δύναμις*, which orders all ; and *ἐπίνοια μεγάλη*, the feminine part, which gives birth to all. In what he says of the creation of the world, our author takes especial pains to pervert Mosaic passages: the description of Paradise into the formation of the child in the mother's womb ; its rivers and the titles of the five books of Moses, and also several Homeric passages, into the five senses ; the story of the Tree of Life, and the cherub with the fiery sword, into the process of generation. The information further given us by the author of the *Philosophumena*, that the *ἐπίνοια*, according to Simon's assertion, was the lost sheep of the Gospel, continues throughout the existence of the world in varying female forms; and thus, among others, dwelling in Helen, caused the Trojan war, till she was at last found at Tyre by Simon ; that Simon appeared in different forms in the kingdoms of various princes of this world, and finally in Judæa in the semblance of man ; that he revealed himself to the Jews as the Son, to the Samaritans as the Father, to other nations as the Holy Ghost ; that his adherents, relying on his redeeming grace, reject the rules of morality and give themselves up to all excesses and magic arts ; that they have pictures of Simon and Helena in the shape of Jupiter and Athene ;—all this coincides so perfectly with the record of Irenæus, that we cannot doubt that our author in parts made direct use of Irenæus, and in parts had the same authority as he had. Now if this authority can neither be held as authentic nor as older than Valentinian Gnosticism, which obviously pervades the pretended Simon, we are forced to doubt whether it even goes so far back as the period of the composition of the Clementine Homilies. But the presence of such a book proves the existence of a party which actually recognized Simon as the highest revelation of the Deity, or at least that the legend of Simon was

made use of by the Gnostics in their own way. Perhaps the passage in the Apostolic Constitutions, vi. 16, and the quotation of Jerome in Matt. xxiv. 5 : *Ego sum servus Dei, ego sum speciosus, ego paracletus, ego omnipotens, ego omnia Dei,* refer to the same writing ; Epiphanius also probably had it before him, as his account of Simon (H. xxi. 1—4) in other respects harmonizes with Irenæus and Hippolytus. Nevertheless, it also contains some things peculiar to itself, and amongst them a quotation from Simon in the first person ; but this individuality is too insignificant to receive further consideration here. Still less need we dwell on others of the later writers, such as Euseb. (H. E. ii. 13) and Theodoret (Fab. Her. i. 1), the former of whom has evidently borrowed from Irenæus and Justin, the latter from Irenæus and the Philosphumena<sup>1</sup> Clement of Alexandria<sup>2</sup> and Origen<sup>3</sup> may also be passed over here, as their brief statements convey nothing new ; still it is not quite without importance to learn from the latter (c. Cels. v 62) that Celsus had also heard of a Christian party of Simonians or Helenians.

Now it is usually supposed that we learn from the Acts the basis of fact on which this fabric of legend is founded ; and with it is associated the statement of Josephus (Ant. xx. 7, 2) respecting a certain Simon, who, as mediator for the Procurator Felix, induced Drusilla to abandon her husband and ally herself to Felix.<sup>4</sup> Thus, for instance, Neander, p 107 f. This Simon, however, has nothing to do with ours. The similarity of name can the less prove the identity of individuals, as the name of

<sup>1</sup> A laborious but very uncritical collection of their statements is to be found in the treatise of Simson already mentioned, Life and Doctrine of Simon Magus (Illgen's Periodical for Hist. Theol. 1841, 3, 15 ff.) ; and in Lutterbeck, Die Neutest. Lehrbegriffe.

<sup>2</sup> Strom. ii. 11, viii. 17, p. 383 b. 764, d. Sylb.

<sup>3</sup> C. Cels. i. 57, v. 72, vi. 11.

<sup>4</sup> The passage, so far as it refers to Simon, runs, (Φῆλιξ) Σίμωνα δύναται τῶν ἱερῶν φιλων, Ἰουδαίον, Κύπριον δὲ γένος, μάγον εἶναι σκηπτόμενον, πέμπων πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐπειδεῖ, τὸν ἀνδρὰ καταλιποῦσαν πίττῃ γῆμασθαι, μακαρίαν ποιήσειν ἵπαγγελλόμενος μηδὲπερηφανήσασαν αὐτόν.

Simon was so unusually common among the Jews,<sup>1</sup> and everything else points to their difference. The Simon of Josephus is a Jew from Cyprus; ours, a Samaritan from the village of Gitton; and the conjecture<sup>2</sup> that this Gitton was derived from the Cyprian Kittion is the more improbable as Josephus does not mention Kittion as the birthplace of his Simon; and as, on the other hand, nearly all our authorities, Justin, both the Clementine writings, Irenæus, pseudo-Origen, Epiphanius and Theodore, describe the Simon of the legend as a Samaritan of Gitton. Moreover, whether the Simon of Josephus really plied the trade of a magician, or whether he merely assumed this mask for the object of his mission to Edessa, is not quite clear from the account of Josephus, though the expression *σκύπτεσθαι* rather favours the second of these alternatives. At all events, in the case before us, he appears only as an ordinary juggler, who makes no further use of his magic; for the words of Josephus, *μακαρίαν ποιήσειν ἐπαγγελλόμενος*, must not be translated as they are by Neander: Simon persuaded Drusilla that by his super-human power (of this there is not a word in Josephus) he would procure her great prosperity. The *ἐπαγγελλόμενος* is not Simon at all, but Felix, in whose lips the *μακαρίαν ποιήσειν* can only mean that he will place her in a brilliant position. The Simon of Josephus can therefore not be used as a fulcrum for the legend of Simon and the narrative of the Acts. So much the more readily might one regard the Simon of the Acts as the historical nucleus to which the patristic legends of the progenitor of all heretics attached themselves, if his historical individuality were sufficiently guaranteed by the evidence of our book, and had a firmer basis in the narrative itself. But as we have already convinced ourselves so frequently how little reliance must be placed on the trustworthiness of our book, and

<sup>1</sup> In the New Testament alone nine Simons appear; among the twelve Apostles there are two Simons and the son of a Simon (Iscaiot); besides this, a brother of Jesus bears this name. The index to Josephus contains twenty-four Simons.

<sup>2</sup> *Hilgenfeld*, The Clementine Recognitions and Homilies, p. 319.

as a great number of further proofs are still to come, the possibility cannot be disputed that, in spite of the evidence before us, the position of Simon Magus may be other than is recorded in our book. This possibility becomes a probability when we examine more closely the connection in which the incident with Simon is here placed. The miracles which are wrought in such numbers form the chief inducement in leading Simon to get himself baptized (viii. 6 f. and 13); and the observation that the Holy Spirit is communicated by the apostolic imposition of hands is what occasions his proposal to Peter and John (v. 18). With these two data our narrative, as we have already remarked above, is so closely interwoven, that without them it would lose all its motive. We should thus be compelled to declare not only the miracles of Philip unhistorical, but of the communication of the Spirit it has also been shown that it is here connected in a truly magical manner with the apostolic imposition of hands. Yet it is exactly this magic by which alone Simon's proposal becomes intelligible. The proposal assumes that the gift of the Spirit came under his eyes as an outwardly perceptible effect, directly connected with the imposition of hands; this is exactly what is said plainly in our book (v. 16—18), and if we consider the analogy of the narratives of the first Feast of Pentecost, of the conversion of Cornelius, and of the baptism of John's disciples (c. xix.), we can scarcely doubt that our author pictures to himself the outpouring of the Spirit on the Samaritans also, with the characteristic phenomenon of speaking with tongues. Now if this effect of the apostolic imposition of hands is not credible, neither can it have produced on Simon the impression which, according to our account, it did produce; and as with this impression the entire motive of Simon's conduct disappears, we must at the same time doubt the reality of the whole incident here recounted.

Who, then, vouches for the fact that Simon Magus ever existed as an historical character? Obviously not our narrative;

for if the author, in the one thing which he relates of the magician, followed an uncertain legend, we have no reason to assume that he knew anything certain about him. Nothing, therefore, remains to those who desire to ascertain the probabilities of this affair, but to examine the legend of Simon as a whole, to see whether it premises an historical personage as its subject, or whether without such premise it may be accounted for on purely mythical grounds, it being of course self-evident that even in the latter case its cause would still consist in definite historical conditions, not in the individuality of a single person, but in the larger generalities of entire tendencies and parties. Now all records of Simon, from Justin forward, agree in this, that a party of Simonians existed, that this party was founded by a magician named Simon, and that Simon was revered by his adherents as the supreme divine power, and, in conjunction with him, the courtezan Helena, as the first thought of the Supreme God. In these data, therefore, we shall have to recognize the germ of the legend of Simon as it existed in the time of Justin. And with this the Acts also essentially coincides. For although it may not mention Helena, nor expressly designate Simon's adherents as Simonians; on the other hand, it intimates that Simon was worshipped in Samaria as a God, for the expression *ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ μεγάλη*, v. 10, can only designate a higher Being, either the Supreme God himself, or the highest of his powers or emanations. When it is therefore said that all Samaritans without exception acknowledged Simon as the great power of God, it confirms Justin's statement that in Samaria he was almost universally regarded as the Supreme God. But this statement, and the stories of Simon in general, contain two things: the testimony of the narrators concerning certain facts of their time, and their testimony respecting the bygone causes of these facts. The existence of a party by which Simon and Helena were adored as the Supreme God and the first emanation of this God, are asserted by our authorities as a fact of their own time; that this Simon was a

magician, and Helena a courtezan, was transmitted to them by tradition if they did not arrive at it by their own conjecture. It is obvious that the first of these testimonies is incomparably more worthy of credit than the second; for, though ancient writers frequently record what is false respecting even contemporaneous phenomena, though they repeat much scandal, especially against heretics, from virulent prejudice or vague rumour, it is nevertheless improbable that a statement so general as that respecting the Simonians should be entirely built on air; whereas the assertions concerning the most ancient heresiarchs and other things of the past, are frequently devoid of all historical foundation. Thus, that there were in Justin's time, and later, two forms of the Deity, the names and attributes of which corresponded to those of Simon and Helena, we must believe on the unanimous evidence of the ancients, and when Justin especially declares that the adoration of Simon and Helena existed exclusively among the Samaritans, and was there almost universal, this statement obtains considerable weight, partly by its accordance with the Acts, partly because Justin was a Samaritan himself; for, little as we should like to trust this Father of the Church unconditionally, even as a pretended eye-witness, after the precedent of Simo Sanctus, it is nevertheless almost incredible that he should have so grossly deceived himself respecting the deities of his native land as to supply information entirely baseless.

The further question can accordingly be only, whether the worship of Simon and Helena is to be traced back to two historical personages of these names, or whether, conversely, the existence of supposed historical personages was assumed only to explain this worship. In this way of putting the question, the answer is already given. For it would be contrary to all historical analogy that a religious sect of that age should have regarded its Founder, during the first generations after his appearance, not merely as a generally superior being, but unreservedly as the manifestation of the Supreme God, and neither

the pagan Apotheoses nor the Christian doctrine of the Son of God would offer a kindred example; for these always relate to a lower grade of the divine dignity, not to the introduction of a supreme national deity, and although the Christian Church has certainly exalted its Founder from humanity to absolute divinity, it took three centuries to accomplish it. Therefore, if Simon and Helena were national divinities, they cannot have been at the same time human beings and contemporaries of the Apostles. It is much more common, on the other hand, with the more ancient Christian theologians, and even with the Jews, after the fashion of euhemeristic Rationalism, to declare the heathen deities to be mere men, kings or magicians who arrogated to themselves divine honours. It is therefore incomparably more probable that Simon the magician, and Helena the courtesan, originated in two deities, than that, conversely, two people of these names and characters should have attained to divine adoration. The same applies also to the hypothesis that Simon originally appeared among the Samaritans as the Messiah;<sup>1</sup> but this, his playing the part of Messiah, is, moreover, among the more ancient witnesses, asserted only by the two Clementine writings, which can appeal in its behalf only to the predicate Ἐστὼς; while even the Homilies are obliged to acknowledge that it is only *intimated* here (*αἰνίσσεσθαι*), and while their artificial interpretation of this word shows that they impute to it that signification without any traditional reason.<sup>2</sup>

What manner of deities they were on which our legend was founded cannot indeed be distinctly said; meanwhile, there is everything to recommend Baur's<sup>3</sup> conjecture, that under the form of Simon, the Sun-god, under that of Helena, the Moon-goddess, lay concealed. For this, besides the names of which one (akin to שָׁמָן γίγְשָׁמָן) represents the Eastern Semo, the

<sup>1</sup> *Ritschl*, Origin of the Ancient Catholic Church.

<sup>2</sup> Neither is Ritschl's interpretation, that Ἐστὼς designates the Messiah, on account of Deut. xviii. 15, προφήτην ἀναστήσει σοι κύριος, much better.

<sup>3</sup> Christian Gnosis, pp 306 ff.

other the Grecian Selene, and besides the designation of Helena in the Recognitions, Baur justly appeals to the description of the latter, her Tyrian origin, the connection in which she is placed (*Homil. ii. 23*) with the lunar month, her character as a courtezan, which is elsewhere ascribed to the Eastern Moon-goddess as the goddess of procreation and birth. Neither has Baur overlooked how suitably also the name of ἑστὼς and the journey from east to west is ascribed to the Eastern Heracles, the Sun-hero, whose symbol is a pillar. That the worship of the Sun-god and the Moon-goddess had many adherents in Samaria is probable in itself, as it was spread throughout all Western Asia, and especially domesticated in Phœnicia; and with the Phœnicians the Samaritans were not only connected by brisk commercial intercourse, but were also lineally related to them through the Phœnician colonies which formed a part of the Samaritan population after the exile. In Josephus, *Ant. xi. 8, 6, xii. 5, 5*, they term themselves *οἱ ἐν Σικίμοις Σιδώνιοι*. Now although the Samaritan party, of whose literature we still possess remains, were strictly monotheistic,<sup>1</sup> this does not impugn the well-accredited fact that, besides these monotheists, numerous polytheists were to be found among that variously intermingled people.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, intercourse with the adherents of the Mosaic religion, to which the worship at Mount Gerizim was consecrated, must certainly have incited the more cultivated polytheists to harmonize their polytheism with monotheism, as had been quite customary among the Greeks since the spread of Stoical philosophy, and still more since the rise of Alexandrian Neopythagoreanism. The deities of the national religion were interpreted as particular manifestations or powers of the one Godhead. Thus also might the Samaritan Sun-god, or Baal Melkart, be converted into a form of revelation, of course by his worshippers into the highest form

<sup>1</sup> Compare on this, *Gesenius*, *De Samarit. Theologia* (Christmas Programme, 1822), pp. 12 f. *Juynboll*, *Chronicon Samarit.* 1848, p. 125.

<sup>2</sup> See *Juynboll*, *Commentarii in Hist. Gentis Samarit.* pp. 32 ff

of revelation, of the unseen God. And such forms of revelation were termed *δυνάμεις* by the Alexandrian school, whose doctrine of the divine powers we meet with, at any rate, among the later Samaritans.<sup>1</sup> For these thoughts, then, the expression, οὐτός ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ μεγάλη (Acts viii. 10), very naturally offered itself, strange as it appears when applied to a human being; and to give a similar interpretation to the Moon-goddess could not be difficult from the same standpoint.

How, on this hypothesis, we are more clearly to explain the origin of this legend of Simon, various conjectures are possible. One might imagine that the legend at its first appearance was merely an evidence of the dissensions betwixt the Christians of Palestine and those adherents of Samaritan paganism who subjected their national deities to a philosophical interpretation. If these Samaritans extolled their God as the Supreme God, and his consort as the *πρώτη ἔννοια*, it was quite in the spirit of the polemics of that age if the Christian party rejoined, "Your God is no God at all, but a magician, and his Helena a common woman." If they vaunted themselves in Gnostic fashion as the true spiritualists, the Christians were naturally obliged to dispute the position that the true Spirit was communicated to them by their Simon; and from this, as a still more emphatic contradiction, might easily proceed the story that the magician had implored the true guardians of the Spirit to bestow on him the power of communicating it, but had not received it. That his request is enforced by bribery is so much the more natural, as it was a pre-established fact that to Simon, as a magician, magic art was a means of acquiring money. Finally, that it should be particularly Peter and John, and more especially Peter, with whom the magician came into conflict, would be explained by the Jewish-Christian origin of the legend of Simon. To the father of false religion, the chiefs of the apostolic band were opposed, but especially Peter, who also on other occasions represents the apostolic circle in the outer world, and whose

<sup>1</sup> *Gesenius*, pp. 21 ff.

name, moreover, offered the advantage of the contrast, that the sorcerer Simon was opposed to the Apostle Simon Peter, and that the Simonian doctrine thus presented itself as a counterfeit, even in name, of the true apostolic teaching. Meanwhile, it cannot be denied that the formation of the legend has an incomparably more satisfactory motive, if we assume with Hilgenfeld<sup>1</sup> and Baur<sup>2</sup> that, even from the first, Simon Magus was meant for the Apostle Paul, who with his extreme followers, a Marcion, a Valentinus, a Basilides, is known to have been combated as Simon in the Clementine Homilies.<sup>3</sup> It is known with what hatred Paul, as the destroyer of the Law, was persecuted by the Ebionites, how little the more zealous Judaists were disposed, even in the years of his most powerful ministry, to allow him the name and dignity of an Apostle. In the Clementine Homilies he is still distinctly designated as the *ἐχθρὸς ἀνθρωπος*, as the *ἀντικείμενος*, as the false Apostle who unjustly boasts of having beheld Christ, as the contemner of God and Christ, who by idle prattle seduced the world to abandon the Law.<sup>4</sup> If this was possible at a time when the glory of a martyr and an Apostle had long shone round his head in the Church, the opponents of Paul must have scrupled the less during his life and soon after his death to brand the destroyer of the Law as a renegade. On their standpoint separation from Judaism could only appear as secession from the God of Israel, as a relapse to paganism; in the requirement that the uncircumcised should be acknowledged as partakers of the Messianic kingdom, they could not see anything but an attempt of the heathen to intrude themselves into the Jewish Church. But the special type of this were the Samaritans, that mongrel people of paganized Jews and born heathens, who, under the guidance of an apostate Jewish

<sup>1</sup> Die Clement. Recogn. 319 f.

<sup>2</sup> Christianity and the Christian Church in the First Three Centuries, p. 83.

<sup>3</sup> I will not guarantee the further hypothesis of Hilgenfeld, that Justin still understood Paul to be alone represented by Simon Magus.

<sup>4</sup> Hom. xvii. 19 Ep. Petri, c. ii.

priest, set up another national sanctuary in opposition to the one at Jerusalem, and who had always vainly endeavoured to procure the recognition of their relationship to the chosen people.<sup>1</sup> There was therefore no more descriptive expression to denote the opinion of the severe Jewish Christians respecting Paulinism, than to proclaim the Pauline uncircumcised Gentile Christians Samaritans. But, then, what could their Apostle be, the author of their lawless heathenish behaviour, but the Samaritan impostor who had erected a new Gerizim antagonistic to Jerusalem,<sup>2</sup> and had perambulated the world from Palestine to Rome to spread his heretical doctrine? Neither can it be surprising that this impostor should subsequently be identified with the national God of Samaria. If the Paulinists were once proclaimed Samaritans, and therefore worshippers of Simon, it was natural that their teacher, whom they acknowledged as their head, should be converted into Simon. According to the view entertained of him by his antagonists, why should he have alienated the world from the true God and the true Messiah, if not to put himself in their place, because he gave himself out to be the God who from that time forward was worshipped by his disciples, the Samaritans? And if his Christian creed and his apostolic character seemed to contradict this representation of him, the answer was ready, that he had only fraudulently professed Christianity, and subjected himself to baptism; but that he had not received the Holy Ghost; and the privilege and badge of the true Apostles, the full power of communicating the Spirit, had been denied him, notwithstanding all his entreaties; from the κλῆρος τῆς ἀποστολῆς (verse 21, comp. i. 17, 25), he was still excluded. This representation of the origin and primitive meaning of the legend of Simon would be particularly well adapted to the narrative in the Acts, for the most ancient tradition of Simon hinges on essentially the same question as the attacks of the Galatian and Corinthian Judaists on Paul, on the question

<sup>1</sup> See for this Jewish view of the Samaritans, especially Josephus, Ant. xi. 8, 6.

<sup>2</sup> Clem. Hom. ii. 22 τὴν Ἰερουσαλήμ ἀρνεῖται τὸ Γαριζεῖν ὅρος ἀντεισφέρει.

of the peculiar privileges of the Apostolate. If in *Acts viii. 18 ff.* we substitute the name of Paul for that of Simon, we have a narrative which says in an historical form what the anti-Pauline Judaists (according to *2 Cor. xi. 4 f., xii. 11 f.; 1 Cor. ix. 1 ff.*) uttered as a general assertion. Perhaps we may account even for the place allotted to our narrative in the *Acts*, the disturbing and unchronological interruption of the record concerning Paul, by ch. viii. 4—10, from the fact that the author, still aware of the meaning of the legend, wished to forestall any application of it to his Apostle even by its position (prior to the conversion of Paul).<sup>1</sup> The further growth of the legend also sanctions this view. For the great majority of Christians of course could not acquiesce in this extreme Ebionite representation of Paul; and the more the Ebionites were gradually compelled to admit heathen Christianity as an accomplished fact, so much the more must the reference of Simon to the Apostle of the Gentiles have lost its meaning even for them. Simon still remained the founder of false Christianity; but the place of the original Paulinism, in which the old Ebionites had embodied secession from the true faith in the Messiah, was taken by the extreme Paulinism of a later age, or Gnosis, and the Samaritan sorcerer became the representative and progenitor of all Gnostic heresies. Herewith the Simonians also, who were originally no other than Samaritans, and the Pauline Gentile Christians reckoned as Samaritans, were converted into a Gnostic party, which, however, never in reality existed as such, or at all events formed itself only subsequently under the influence of the legend itself. The latter hypothesis is recommended by the statements of Irenæus and Celsus respecting the Simonians, and by the pretended work of Simon known to Irenæus and the false Origen. But how little, even at a later period and in spite of this alteration, the legend of Simon can repudiate its primitive reference to Paul and Paulinism, may be seen, even regardless of the *Acts*

<sup>1</sup> We shall later point out a further and not quite unimportant confirmation of this hypothesis, in the story of the disciples of John.

and the Clementine works, from a feature which in all records constitutes the actual point of the whole, namely, that Simon's decisive struggle with Peter is transferred to Rome. For how can we explain the constant return of this utterly unhistorical feature, if not by this, that the legend, although originating first in Palestine, was further perfected at Rome with reference to the circumstances of the Roman community ? What is the magician but a caricature of the Apostle who journeyed from Palestine through all countries westwards, preaching his anti-Jewish Gospel, and finally attempted to bring his doctrine into general recognition in the City of the World, to whom just here Judaism, or expressed mythically the representative of this tendency, the Apostle Peter, offered the most stubborn resistance ? The tradition of Peter's presence in Rome, which, unhistorical as it is, can only be explained by an anti-Pauline interest, is universally connected in the most ancient records with his relation to Simon. The conjecture is natural, that Peter's two acts, the conquest of the magician and the institution of the Roman Church, originally belonged to each other and express the same thesis, viz. that not legal Paulinism, but Jewish Christianity —the faith that not the pagan pseudo-Apostle, but the Jewish prince of the Apostles, was the founder of that Church. From his entire standpoint, the author of the Acts, even if he found the legend of Simon already in this shape, was certainly unable to give it a direct refutation ; but he has indirectly contradicted it as distinctly as possible, inasmuch as he has placed his notice of Simon Magus before the appearance of Paul, and, as we shall see below, has made the Apostle Paul the actual founder of the Roman community. These are naturally mere suppositions, such as are alone possible respecting so obscure a matter, but they are, as we believe, conjectures whereby the whole of the legendary traditions of Simon Magus may be most easily apprehended.

However this be, so much may at any rate be asserted with great probability, that Simon Magus was no historical person,

and that our book, with its narrative concerning him, renders the influence of the mythical legend of Simon unmistakably evident.

To the narrative of the ministry of Philip and the Apostles in Samaria, the Acts (viii. 26) subjoins the scene between Philip and the Ethiopian eunuch, although it could not be directly attached to it; for the direction to go on the way between Jerusalem and Gaza (verse 26) cannot be obeyed from any part of Samaria without long delay. According to the intention of our author, Philip seems (which is quite permissible by verse 25) to have returned to Jerusalem with the Apostles, whence he naturally had to go, κατὰ μεσημβρίαν ἐπὶ τὴν καταβαίνονταν ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ εἰς Γάζαν. That Philip goes on the road to Gaza occurs at the command of an angel; that he addresses the Ethiopian, at the command of the Spirit, after he has baptized him, he is carried away by the Spirit in a miraculous manner. If the command of the Spirit may be explained in a natural way, by the internal impulse of the Evangelist, the other two features, on the contrary, elude every explanation of the sort. To take the ἄγγελος κυρίου as synonymous with the πνεῦμα κυρίου, is forbidden by the unvarying usage of language; to transfer his appearance to a vision is forbidden by the text, which would necessarily have notified this had it been the meaning of the author. Moreover, it would have been too strange a coincidence if Philip, led only by his own presentiment, or even by a dream, should actually have found upon the road what he could not have prognosticated in any natural manner. The being carried away by the Spirit, not only the older rationalists, but likewise Olshausen and Meyer, interpret as a rapid hastening away by the impulse of the Spirit, in which nothing supernatural is supposed. But this meaning can no more be attributed to the expression, πνεύματι ἀρπάξεσθαι, than to the corresponding Hebrew, “פְּנַפְלָךְ תִּתְהַרֵּךְ,” for it can only mean a miraculous transfer from one place to another, such as occurs in 1 Kings xviii. 12; 2 Kings ii. 16; and in our author himself, Luke xxiv. 21. That

such is meant is also shown by the addition, Φίλιππος δὲ εὐρέθη εἰς Ἀξωτόν, which would only be possible if he came there in a mysterious way. In what manner the Spirit carried him away (through the air and so on), one must not inquire amid the miracle and mystery of the whole proceeding. Now that our narrative is void of all historical foundation on this account is not probable, as even the dogmatic interest of possessing one more precedent of a Pauline conversion of the Gentiles does not afford sufficient motive for a pure fiction;<sup>1</sup> but in what this historical element consisted cannot be discovered now; and only the native country and individuality of the converted Ethiopian appear to be historical.

### 3 PETER AT JOPPA AND CÆSAREA ; CORNELIUS.

According to viii. 40, Christianity was spread by Philip through the coast regions between Ashdod and Cæsarea, without our being informed whether it was still limited in these parts to Jews and proselytes, or not. From xi. 19 we are almost obliged to assume the former. The first decided example of the conversion of a Gentile, according to the representation of our book, is given by Peter in the baptism of Cornelius.

The two miracles at the conclusion of the 9th chapter serve as an introduction to the detailed account of the event given in the 10th and 11th chapters. During a visit to the communities won over chiefly by Philip, Peter first cures the eight years' lameness of Eneas at Lydda (Diospolis), and afterwards raises Tabitha from the dead at Joppa. That it is here intended to relate actual miracles is beyond doubt. Even the friends of a naturalistic interpretation have scarcely made an attempt to apply it to the healing of Eneas; and it is really difficult to conceive its possibility. The death of Tabitha is indeed explained by a now

<sup>1</sup> The Ethiopian is at least not expressly described as a heathen; and if it has been concluded from the predicate εὐνοῦχος that (according to Deut. xxiii. 2) he could not have been a proselyte of the narrower grade, it becomes a question whether εὐνοῦχος here indicates physical constitution or official position.

exploded exegesis in the usual manner of a death merely apparent; our book, however, describes it quite distinctly as an actual death; it simply says, ἐγένετο ἀσθενήσας αὐτὴν ἀποθανεῖν; and, to leave no doubt whatever, it expressly remarks that the customary washing of the corpse of the deceased had already been accomplished when Peter arrived. That the deceased was only apparently dead may be believed by any one who thinks it credible that, in the short space of time occupied by Gospel and apostolic history, in the three instances of raising from the dead in the Gospel as well as in the two of the Acts, one and the same case of apparent death occurred, which, imperceptible to all who were busied about the deceased, gave way at the first word of a divine messenger, and occasioned the belief in an actual raising from the dead. Whoever scruples to have such unlimited recourse to an accident of the most remarkable kind, this *Deus ex machina* of natural interpretation, will be compelled to admit that in all these cases, as far as historical probability will go, either a miracle occurred, or no incident at all resembling what is related. Which side of the dilemma must be taken by historical criticism cannot indeed, after what has been already remarked, in and of itself be doubted for a moment; in the present case it is, moreover, shown by two special features—the unhistorical exaggerations in the description of the miracles and their results, and the relation of our narratives to those akin to them in the Gospel and apostolic history. As to the latter, the cure of the lame man may be compared to the kindred narratives in Matt. ix. 6; Luke v. 24; Acts iii. 1 ff, xiv. 8 (likewise John v. 8); the raising of Tabitha especially recalls the story of Jairus's daughter<sup>1</sup> (Mark v. 22 ff.), as well as

<sup>1</sup> *Acts ix. 36.* μαθήτρια ὀνόματι Ταβίθᾳ, ἡ δερμηνευομένη λέγεται Δορκάς.

Verso 40 f. : ἐκβαλὼν δὲ ἔξω πάντας δὲ Πέτρος θεῖς τὰ γόνατα προσηγένετο· καὶ ἐπιστρέψας πρὸς τὸ σῶμα ἐπέτει Ταβίθᾳ, ἀνάστησε. ἡ δὲ . . . ἀνεκάδισε. δοῦς δὲ αὐτῇ χείρα ἀνίστησεν αὐτήν.

Mark 40 ff. ὁ δὲ ἐκβαλὼν ἅπαντας . . . εἰσπορεύεται . . . καὶ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ παιδίου λέγει αὐτῇ ταῦτα κοῦμε· ὃ ἐστι μεδερμηνεύμενον· τὸ κοράσιον σοὶ λέγω ἔγειρε. καὶ εὑδέως ἀνέστη τὸ κοράσιον καὶ περιεπάτει.

Luke vii. 15 (the young man at Nain): καὶ ἀνικάθισεν ὁ νεκρός.

the general type of restoration from the dead in both the Old and New Testaments (see Baur, p. 192). That our narrative here adheres more to Mark than to Luke is accounted for, if it is not derived from our author himself, but from another to whom this Gospel or its source lay nearer. The other, an un-historical exaggeration, is to be found even in the smaller miracle of the healing of the lame man, when in verse 35 it says, *καὶ εἰδον αὐτὸν* (the healed man) *πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες Λυδίᾳ καὶ τὸν Σάρωνα, οἵτινες ἐπέστρεψαν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον.* If the apostolic miracles had had this effect, all Palestine—nay, one would have imagined the whole world—would have been converted in a very short time; however, we find elsewhere at least no decisive results of the accumulated miracles worked by the Apostles among their countrymen, but, in spite of these miracles, a comparatively small portion as yet embracing Christianity. The colouring is certainly much stronger in the second miracle, the raising from the dead. Immediately after Tabitha's death, Peter is at once summoned from Lydda (verse 38), obviously in the expectation that he will still bring help.<sup>1</sup> But how could the Christians of Joppa expect in a natural manner such an entirely extraordinary event as the raising of the dead? This feature is undeniably somewhat legendary, and is more suited to the miraculous representations of a later age respecting the Apostles than to historical reality. When, further, verse 39, on the arrival of Peter, all the widows of the town, or at least of the Church (the *πᾶσαι ai χῆραι* cannot well be understood otherwise), are there, and display the clothes which Tabitha had made for them, this too gives the impression of an exhibition calculated for effect; the merits of the deceased are displayed with the utmost pomp before the Apostle and the reader, as a motive for the miraculous reward of these merits. To this, finally, corresponds the solemn presentation of the resuscitated woman to the

<sup>1</sup> This accounts, as Meyer justly points out, for verse 37, *ὅθηκαν αὐτὴν ἐν ὑπερῷῳ.* The *ὑπερῷον*, the bed and state-room of the house, would scarcely otherwise serve as the chamber of the dead; here it is thus employed, that the Apostle may find a worthy place for his miraculous prayer.

assembled Christians and the widows who bewailed her. The particulars, which reflection naturally imagines when contemplating such an event, are here depicted in so many individual dramatic scenes; the desire for help becomes a formal message to the Apostle; the special cause of this desire leads to the scene with the widows; the idea that the desire was now actually fulfilled by the miracle to the concluding scene. This is quite in the manner of legendary fiction; in reality, events are not wont to develope themselves so dramatically.

Still more important, however, for our narrative, as well as for our opinion of it, is the event to which the two miraculous stories serve as a prelude, namely, the conversion of Cornelius, x 1—11, 18. The thing that first strikes us in this event is the accumulation of visions and appearances by which it is introduced. First, an angel appears to Cornelius, who is in a state of rapture (*ἐν ὅραματι*), and commands him to send for Peter from Joppa; the next day, while his messengers are on the way to Joppa, the natural equality of the heathens with the Jews with respect to admission to the kingdom of God is announced to Peter by a symbolical vision; finally, a third revelation is made to Peter inasmuch as, after the arrival of the messengers, the Spirit informs him of their coming, and gives him the order to go with them without delay. To this miraculous introduction corresponds, at the end of the transaction between Peter and Cornelius, the miraculous communication of the Spirit, exhibiting itself in speaking with tongues, which actually produces the result towards which all these miracles are directed, namely, the baptism of the Gentile by the Apostle.

The work of explaining these miracles by natural means has this time, as in so many other cases, been undertaken by Neander,<sup>1</sup> although, as his custom is, vaguely, and in such a manner that a place is reserved for the miracle as well as for the natural causes. In the first place, to render the vision of Cornelius intelligible to us, he assumes that this Gentile was

<sup>1</sup> History of the Planting and Training, &c., pp. 118 ff

not only generally familiar with the Messianic expectations as a proselyte of the gate, but that he had also heard something of the promulgation of the gospel and its Apostle Peter. By further supplementing our record with various features, he thus gains the following representation of the whole proceeding: Cornelius had devoted himself several days to prayer and fasting; the subject of his prayer was probably superior enlightenment on what he was to think of Christianity and of Peter. In this state "he received an answer to his prayer by a voice from heaven." That this may also really have occurred by means of an angel is indeed possible, and "only reason as bigoted as it is presumptuous can deny the possibility;" but yet Cornelius might also have deceived himself as to the objective reality of the appearance, and have mistaken a vision for something actual. It is evident that this hypothesis is the most agreeable to Neander; and although he does not directly dispute the opposite conjecture, he is still of opinion that at all events the whole phenomenon admits of a natural explanation. This succeeds more easily, as might be expected, with the vision of Peter. Peter was making the usual mid-day prayer. "We may readily believe that this specially referred to the extension of Christ's kingdom." A struggle between particularism and universalism might now break forth in his soul. "While this occupied him in prayer, the baser nature asserted its rights;" and from the two influences working in combination, his bodily requirements and his religious contemplation, the vision arose. "While he sought the connection between this apparition and the meditations which had previously occupied him, the incident which immediately followed taught him to perceive what the Spirit of God intended by the vision. A noise in the outer court of the house, in which he heard his name mentioned, attracted his attention. It was the three messengers of Cornelius asking after him." "As Peter observed the three men, who from their appearance struck him as Gentiles, the Spirit of God at once allowed him to recognize the connection between that which was to become

evident to him by the vision, and that which now occurred before his eyes. He follows them, enters the house of Cornelius, speaks to him and to those assembled with him, and as now all conditions which constitute a living faith in the Saviour were present in the spiritual state of this man so eager for salvation, such a faith could soon be awakened by the powerful witness of Peter, and after such preparatives could sooner take place with more than usual rapidity." "While Peter was still speaking to them they found themselves impelled to give utterance to their feelings in inspired praises of God." Peter, overcome by the impression, sees all Jewish prejudices refuted by the fact, and admits them to baptism.

The miraculous element in our narrative would thus certainly be reduced to so slight a residuum that we could rid ourselves of that also without any trouble. But whether in so doing we merely supplement what is indicated by the given features of our record, must be doubted with good reason. Even in the vision of Cornelius, Neander has not only added so much to the record of the Acts, but has likewise omitted so much that is important, that the occurrence in his paraphrase is no longer the same as in the text. That the spiritual state of Cornelius was exactly as he conjectures, and that his prayer referred exactly to the Messianic salvation, one might admit as possible, little as our narrative may indicate it. That, on the other hand, the appearance of the angel is described by the Acts as an objective one, Neander must likewise acknowledge; and even on account of the *φανερῶς*, x. 3, and the categorical ὡς ἀπῆλθεν δὲ ἄγγελος, it cannot well be denied; but that it must therefore have been so, is a question. Still, if the angel not only gives Cornelius the general commission to summon Peter, but also specifies the residence of the Apostle with perfect correctness, how is it possible that it can have been a mere phantasm of the praying man's imagination? Cornelius, Neander is of opinion, had in all probability already heard of Peter, and even the description of his residence might have

reached him previously ; and the forgotten information revived in his excited state of mind. But then our account would be so deceptive that we should have no more certainty respecting its other statements. A writer who converts a perfectly natural recollection of something previously heard into the supernatural communication of an angel, and an imaginary vision into an objective phenomenon, might justifiably be credited with any other confusion or deficiency of judgment. Neander therefore finally inclines to the opinion that the designation of Peter's abode was supernaturally communicated to Cornelius. If this, however, is once admitted, the appearance of the angel also cannot be evaded ; and as little can it be maintained, as by Neander, that this appearance, even if objective, need not therefore have been "sensuous." If the appearance of the angel was something real, it was likewise something sensuous ; for how a man in bright clothing (x. 30) is to be perceived except by the senses has yet to be demonstrated ; and it is only a confusion of every proper point of view when Neander observes in p 123 : "We do not know whether a higher Spirit is not able to communicate itself to man dwelling in the world of sense by operating on the inward sense, so that this communication presents itself to him only in the form of a sensuous perception." (Neander rather means an *outward* perception, for the perceptions of the inward sense are likewise sensuous.) Whatever presents itself as an outward perception, without being so, is a deception ; by means of a deception, a higher Spirit would by no means communicate itself.

Neander is guilty of a similar confusion of ideas respecting the vision of Peter. That this can have been no natural product of his frame of mind, but only something supernaturally effected, is incontrovertibly evinced by the circumstance that the vision takes place precisely at the moment at which the messengers of Cornelius reached the dwelling of the Apostle. Neander himself is obliged to acknowledge (p. 124) that in this coincidence of remarkable circumstances "the guiding wisdom

of the eternal Love is undeniably revealed ;” and he accordingly speaks of “the object of the Spirit of God in the vision of Peter.” Something providential, therefore, though not miraculous. But what is thereby gained ? Of what use is this rationalistic *non sine numine* ? Peter sees a vision in which the Spirit of God has an object which he has also probably effected ; by divine guidance, this vision coincides in the most remarkable manner, at the appropriate moment, with external circumstances, and that is no miracle ? Where, then, is the token by which the ordinary guidance of Providence is to be distinguished from the miraculous ? and how is it possible to remove miracle in general if the direct interference of the Divine Spirit in the spiritual life of mankind is to be maintained ?

The second revelation bestowed on Peter, the disclosure of the Spirit respecting the arrival of the messengers (verse 19), is rendered natural by means of the hypothesis, that the attention of the Apostle being attracted to the new arrival by a noise in the outer court, in which he heard his name mentioned, he at once notices three men, recognizes them by their appearance as Gentiles, and *now, for the first time*, feels himself impelled by an inward voice to follow them. Of this, however, so little appears in our text that Peter rather learns the arrival of the ambassadors from the Spirit, and this is here, as in the New Testament generally, not merely an “inward voice,” but a transcendental principle different from man, which likewise speaks expressly as such in verse 20 (*ἐγώ ἀπέσταλκα αὐτούς*). And later also, in the scene at the house of Cornelius, equally little is the operation of the principle merely that religious enthusiasm which, after sufficient inward preparation (the text entirely ignores such), is called forth by the address of the Apostle ; when, much more, this operation is described in x 44 by the words, *ἐπέπεσε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον ἐπὶ πάντας . . . ἥκουν αὐτῶν λαλούντων γλώσσαις*, we cannot even require the explicit assurance of Pet. xi. 15 (*ἐπέπεσε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ὥσπερ καὶ ἐφ' ήμᾶς ἐν ἀρχῇ*) to know that it is here intended to indicate the same miraculous appear-

ance of which our second chapter contains the full description, a supernaturally effected speaking in foreign languages ; and that Neander's naturalistic interpretation of this phenomenon is as inadmissible here as there. The "natural pragmatic connection" which Neander wishes to restore by "supplementing" our text can only be attained by the most forcible mistreatment of it ; our account itself shews us, instead of a natural psychological development, a thoroughly supernatural course of events, determined in every particular by the most obvious miracles ; and to supplement this course of events "by the laws of analogy" is to falsify it ; for how could these laws be applied to phenomena whose essence and character consists in the contradiction of every other analogy ?

Such a course of events can certainly be the less regarded as historical, the more difficult it becomes to imagine sufficient motive for these' miracles. That all the supernatural arrangements should have been made merely for the sake of Cornelius is not credible, if only because this man might, even without such means, have easily become acquainted with Christianity in Caesarea, the abode of Philip the Evangelist , and because, according to Baur's pertinent remark (p 79), he comports himself very passively with regard to what befalls him ; for of the inward development of his faith, of which Neander is able to tell us, so little appears in our text, that, according to x. 32, Cornelius apparently does not at all know what manner of communication he has to expect from Peter. Still less, of course, can the friends and relations of Cornelius have known whom (x. 24) he bids to his house ; for respecting them also nothing is said of previous faith. Nevertheless, the Spirit falls at once upon them all. So far as the production of a genuine faith was concerned, such a magical communication of the Spirit and the gift of tongues (it is, moreover, difficult to see what these people were to do with it) were scarcely the most appropriate means. The object of the miracle must have consisted not in them, but in the instruction of Peter and of the community at Jerusalem. That this was actu-

ally the intention of our author is obvious; for as by the acknowledgment of Pet. x. 30, *ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι προσωπολήπτης ὁ θεός*, a light first opens on the meaning of the previous arrangements hitherto incomprehensible, so the whole narrative culminates in the primitive church's conviction of the validity of the conversion of the Gentiles, xi. 18; and how anxious the author is to make this conviction appear as the result of the whole incident, we see best in the ground of the conviction given in the address of Peter, ch. xi., which so minutely recapitulates what has been previously related only because the author cannot inculcate too urgently how unmistakable are the revelations on which it rests. Even with Peter and the Jerusalemites our miracles must have very incompletely attained their object. How little the idea of Gentile conversion took root in Jerusalem is best shown by the incidents of the so-called apostolic council, which not only in the Epistle to the Galatians, but likewise in our book, is described as if the principles of Pauline universalism were still new and strange even to the Apostles,<sup>1</sup> for Peter, xv. 7, is there obliged to recall the earlier occurrence as something quite forgotten, of which there had been no mention in the previous transactions. Prior to this reminder, no one seems to have thought any more of this obvious declaration of the Divine will and of the conviction gained by it, that God wished the way of salvation to be opened to the Gentiles also.<sup>2</sup> But with regard to Peter, the Epistle to the Galatians makes it questionable whether he can actually have spoken thus, and entertained this convic-

<sup>1</sup> More on this later.

<sup>2</sup> Although Schneckenburger's remark (*Zweck der Apg*, 179), which is repeated by Lechler (*Apost. and Post-Apost Age*, 240), that the toleration of Gentile baptism in one individual and quite extraordinary case did not involve the acknowledgment of its principle in all other cases, is not incorrect in its generality; but the baptism of Cornelius is not merely a question of this individual case, but of the principle of Gentile baptism, as our book says often enough (x. 34 f., xi. 18, xv. 7 ff. 14 ff.); and after this principle has been sanctioned by the most obvious declarations of the Divine will, and is most distinctly acknowledged by Peter and the community at Jerusalem, it is supposed not only to be abandoned in practice, but also to have entirely disappeared from the minds of the Jewish Christians at Jerusalem. That is assuredly incredible.

tion. It is of itself most striking that Paul, as far as we can judge from his own account, neither then, where the justification of Gentile baptism was concerned, nor yet later, when he reproaches Peter with his fickleness, the inconsistency between his previous and his subsequent demeanour,—that Paul, in neither of these cases, makes use of the most overwhelming evidence, the precedent of Peter himself, the revelations imparted to him on the occasion, and the principles enunciated by him. It is equally improbable that he did not do this at all, and that he should have passed over the subject, if the incident actually occurred as our book relates it; the affair was too important for his object not to be alluded to. But the conduct of Peter himself, in the well-known dispute at Antioch, is likewise, according to Gforer's just remark,<sup>1</sup> quite incomprehensible on the premises presented by our narrative. Neander, indeed, refers us (p. 352) to Peter's denial, which in like manner followed the most explicit witness in favour of Christ. But the case is here very different. At the denial, it was a case of evading an immediate peril of life by deceiving people to whom Peter might not have felt himself bound to make his confession; of a concealment, contrary to truth, respecting his personal relations with the enemy. The one was a weakness, a proof that the Apostle was at that time wanting in the heroic courage of which he had previously boasted. In the occurrence at Antioch, it was on account of the members of the Christian community itself that Peter withdrew from the Gentile Christians; and this hypocrisy was not an affair of the personal peculiarities of the Apostle, but of the decisive principles of the apostolic office and its duties. What a notion must we have of the leading Apostle's fitness of character for his calling if he was capable of being so contemptibly disloyal to a conviction impressed upon him by the most explicit divine revelations, acted upon by him for many years, and which through him had gained acceptance in the community, and this for the sake of a

<sup>1</sup> Die heilige Sage, 1. 415.

few fanatics whom he might at once have reduced to silence by encountering them with the remembrance of the incidents and resolves known to all;<sup>1</sup> and what notion also of the Holy Ghost (whose most distinguished instrument the Apostle appears in this very book), if it cannot even preserve him from a step from which every man of character is shielded by sober moral discipline, from the open denial of a deeply-rooted principle founded on the most unequivocal facts, confirmed by the most formal declarations, and of the highest importance for the cause to which his life is devoted! And in case of a doubt, which is the most probable, that all these miracles mentioned by our narrative should have occurred without producing any lasting effect either on the community or on Peter himself, that this Apostle, in spite of the most positive divine declarations, should have behaved as, according to the undoubted evidence of Paul, he did; or that a book of whose historical unreliability we have already had the most striking proofs, incorrectly presupposes miracles and revelations, the acceptance of which gives rise to the whole insolvable problem?<sup>2</sup>

Several other subordinate features cast suspicion on the authenticity of our narrative. Ch. x. 28, Peter says to Cornelius and his companions: "Ye know that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company or come unto one of another nation; but God hath showed me that I should not call any man common or unclean Therefore came I unto you with-

<sup>1</sup> On this, compare the striking remarks of *Schwegler*, Post-Apost. Age, i 127 ff

<sup>2</sup> The case appears quite different if we confine ourselves to the account given by Paul. We need not then accuse his fellow-Apostle of the denial of a distinctly known conviction founded on revelations, but only of the relapse to an opinion which he had never really overcome, but of which he had rather only temporarily renounced the exercise before the power of a pre-eminent character and an accomplished fact. This might be cowardly feebleness, but that is not a rare weakness even in honourable men, although from his own standpoint Paul may judge it more harshly. Without any reason, *Neander* (p. 114) appeals to Gal. ii. 14 to prove "how liberally Peter had hitherto behaved respecting the Mosaic Law." The *λογικῶς ζῆν*, with which Peter is here reproached, refers plainly enough to his having previously sat at the same table with the heathen at Antioch (according to verse 12), and not to the general habits of his life.

out gainsaying." Here then it is assumed that all intercourse with the heathen is forbidden to the Jews, or at least any entrance into the house of a heathen. De Wette, however, justly remarks on this passage: "Even if such a prohibition (of which we otherwise know nothing) existed with regard to idolaters, it is quite incomprehensible that it should apply to the *σεβομένους*, and even the stricter Jews cannot have shunned their society, as they would have otherwise been obliged to abandon their conversion"—as to which De Wette refers to the well-known saying of Jesus in Matt. xxiii. 15 respecting the Pharisees, who compass land and sea to make proselytes; and to the narrative of Josephus, Ant. xx. 2, 4 f., on the conversion of king Izates of Adiabene and his household. These testimonies are quite overpowering; and independently of this, it is incredible, considering the varied intercourse between Jews and heathens at that period, that a prohibition such as that indicated could have existed even in the Pharisaic party. In the Clementines, too, which certainly represent the Jewish Christian custom with fidelity in this respect, Peter perpetually comes in contact with the heathen. And to refer the *κολλάσθαι γ' προσέρχεσθαι* of our verse to fellowship at table, would be as much opposed to the meaning of the words as to the context. It does not at all follow that because Peter had come to Cornelius, he must needs eat with him also. Hence it is obvious that words are attributed to Peter which he cannot have spoken.'

It seems to be the same with regard to the reproach which Peter, xi. 3, receives at Jerusalem: ὅτι πρὸς ἄνδρας ἀκροβυστίαν ἔχοντας εἰσῆλθες καὶ συνέφαγες αὐτοῖς. As the chief point in what had occurred had not been the visit to Cornelius and fellowship at table with him and his, but the bestowal of baptism on the uncircumcised,—moreover, as Peter in consequence vindicates himself not with respect to the former but solely the latter,—this rebuke does not seem at all to harmonize with the import of our narrative, and it is natural to conclude with Gforer (in the above work), that if the Apostle was only

reproached with eating with Gentiles, the far more dubious transaction, the reception of the Gentiles into the Church, could not have taken place. Now we certainly see, not only from Gal. ii. 12 ff., but also from the Clementine writings,<sup>1</sup> what stress the more rigid Jews laid on fellowship at table, which was reckoned an admission of full religious brotherhood. But this does not remove the striking phenomenon that the chief point of dispute itself is omitted in the address (xi. 3); and that the subsequent answer of Peter does not by any means directly apply to the accusation brought against him; and if to this be added our previous conclusions respecting the historical character of the narrative, it is almost impossible to avoid the suspicion that the remarkable speech was derived from the remembrance of another incident, which may after all have been the single fact which gave rise to our account, namely, the frequently mentioned dispute at Antioch, in which the single and sole question was the *συνεσθίειν*.

Moreover, if we have already found the Pauline principles suspicious in the mouth of Peter, it is also very striking here that, according to our book, he must have enunciated these principles in the very words of Paul. For the famous declaration of the equality of all nations before God is found in quite similar expressions in Rom. ii. 10 f.,<sup>2</sup> as also verse 36 reminds us of Rom. x. 15 (Eph. ii. 17). It is assuredly more likely that

<sup>1</sup> See Hom. i. 22 (of Peter, Clement relates out of the period at which he was still unbaptized) καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν καὶ τροφῆς αὐτὸς μεταλαβὼν ιδίᾳ κάμῃ μεταλαβεῖν ἐκέλευσεν· εὐλογήσας δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς τροφῆς καὶ εὐχαριστήσας μετὰ τὸ κορεσθῆναι καὶ αὐτοῦ τούτουν τὸν λόγον μοι ἀπόδοντες ἐπήγαγε λέγων· δώῃ σοι ὁ θεὸς κατὰ πάντα ἔξομοιωθῆναι μοι καὶ βαπτισθέντα τῆς αὐτῆς μοι μεταλαβεῖν τραπέζης. But according to the doctrinal ideas of the Clementine writings, baptism with the Gentile Christians takes the place of circumcision. Further, compare Hom. xv. i. and ii. 19, where Jesus says to the woman of Canaan: οὐκ ἔξεστιν ίᾶσθαι τὰ ἔθνη, ἵουκότα κυσίν, διὰ τὸ διαφόρος χρῆσθαι τροφαῖς καὶ πράξειν, whereupon she embraces Judaism; and τῷ ὅμοιῳ διαιτᾶσθαι τοῖς τῆς βασιλείας νιοῖς τῆς εἰς τὴν θυγατέρα ἔτυχεν ίάσεως. Further references in Hilgenfeld, Clement. Recogn. 152 f.; Galaterbrief, 59.

<sup>2</sup> Acts: οὐκ ἔστι προσώπολή πτης ὁ θεὸς, ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ ἔθνει ὁ φοβούμενος αὐτὸν καὶ ἡργαζόμενος δικαιοσύνην δεκτὸς αὐτῷ ἔστιν. Rom.: δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἡργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθὸν, ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι· οὐ γάρ ἔστι προσωποληψία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ.

the author of the Acts followed here the Epistle to the Romans, than that Peter and Paul by mere accident coincided in expression. In the same way, we shall most naturally explain the resemblance of x. 26 with Acts xiv. 15, of x. 42 with Acts xvii. 31, by supposing that in all these cases only one and the same person speaks in reality. Finally, if a speech which the Evangelists unanimously ascribe to John the Baptist (Matt. iii. 11; Mark i. 8; Luke iii. 16; John i. 33) is quoted (c. xi. 16) as a saying of Jesus, the quotation of the same speech in i. 5 puts it beyond doubt that the confusion was made, not by Peter, but by Luke; for that Jesus really repeated the words of the Baptist verbatim is not likely, considering the silence of all the Gospel records.

After all these discussions, we cannot avoid pronouncing the statement unhistorical that Peter baptized a Gentile previously to the council of Apostles and the missionary journeys of Paul. If, therefore, it should be true that he baptized a Roman centurion of the name of Cornelius, the latter could have been no heathen, but a proselyte; and even if he were merely a proselyte of the gate<sup>1</sup> he could only have received baptism from Peter on the assumption that by this semi-conversion to Judaism he had ceased to be a heathen.<sup>2</sup> But in our account it is precisely the

<sup>1</sup> As *Ritschl* and many others suppose: *Origin of the Ancient Catholic Church*, 122 f.

<sup>2</sup> It is, moreover, still disputed whether, at the time of Christ, proselytes of the gate existed in the real sense of the words; and if the frequently mentioned *σεβόμενοι* occupy a similar position, it is yet a question whether they were acknowledged as Jewish believers so far as not to be any longer reckoned as heathens. Certainly the Clementine writings essentially connect the baptism of the heathen only with the same conditions as those which Acts xv. requires from the Gentile Christians (*Ritschl* elsewhere, 118 ff.); and in Acts xiii. 16, xxvi. 43, xvi. 14, xvii. 17, closer intercourse of the *σεβόμενοι* with the national Jews is assumed. But for the question before us, these passages are not decisive; still less can the standpoint of the Clementine writings, which had heathen Christianity before them as an incontrovertible fact that necessarily moderated their demands, be taken as evidence of the opinions of the most ancient Christians prior to the appearance of Paul. When Iziates of Adiabene was hesitating whether he should be circumcised, one of his two Jewish advisers was of opinion that, considering the great danger connected with it in his case, God would be sure to pardon the omission of this step; the

baptism of the heathen which is the chief point; though Cornelius may be described in x. 2 as *φοβούμενος*, our book nevertheless incontestably treats him as a heathen (x. 14 f., 28, xi. 1 ff., 18); and only in his being so, only in the highly important principle of Gentile baptism in general being involved in this, the first case where an uncircumcised person was baptized, consists the significance of our narrative which the author makes so prominent, and the motive of the miracles so profusely distributed throughout its whole course. The essential import of the narrative is therefore at all events unhistorical, whether it be founded on no historical fact at all, or on the insignificant fact of the baptism of a proselyte, which determined nothing concerning the admission of the heathen to Christian communion; and we may therefore temporarily reserve its further investigation until we have found the means of solving the problem in connection with other discussions.

---

### THIRD DIVISION.

#### P A U L

---

##### 1. THE CONVERSION AND FIRST APPEARANCE OF PAUL.

In the narrative of the Acts, this event, which forms the first decisive turning-point in the history of Christianity, is attached immediately to the execution of Stephen. That this was the actual connection of the events is undoubted; but for the object in view it nevertheless seemed preferable to group together all that concerns Paul, and this was so much the easier as the Acts also interposes the account of his conversion (ix. 1—30) as an independent whole between chapters viii. and ix. 31, &c.

other, more rigid in his views, does not admit even this excuse; but that it was generally possible to be a partaker of the Divine kingdom without circumcision, even the first does not venture to assert. *Jos. Ant.* xx. 2, 5.

With regard to the historical credibility of this account, and in particular the story of the conversion as such (verses 1—18), besides internal reasons, it is well known that there are also contradictions among the external evidences, which have produced mistrust. When we compare the narrative given by our author in his own name (ix.) with the two attributed to Paul (xxii. 6—10, xxvi. 14), we find the following differences between them.

1. Of Paul's companions it is said in xxvi. 14, that they all fell to the ground; in ix. 7, on the contrary, that they all remained standing in amazement while Paul fell down in terror. The two cannot be harmonized by the hypothesis (Bengel's, Kuinol's and others), that although they fell down at first, they got up again before the Apostle, and heard the words of the 7th verse while standing; when it is said that one fell and the others stood, no one can understand that all fell, and that one only remained prostrate longer than the others.

2. Of the same persons it is said, ix. 7, that they indeed heard the voice which spoke to Paul, but saw no one; xxii. 9, on the contrary, that they saw the light which appeared to him, but did not hear the voice. This contradiction has also been very insufficiently removed by the harmonistic interpreters. In ix., the *φωνὴ* is to be understood as the voice of Paul; in xxii., as the voice of Christ; although in the first passage even the article points to the *φωνὴ* of Christ mentioned in verse 4, the only one, moreover, which could here be thought of. Or else a distinction is made between the *φωνὴ τοῦ λαλοῦντος*, xxii., and the simple *φωνὴ*, ix., the former alone being interpreted as meaning clearly apprehensible words, the latter as an indistinct tone,<sup>1</sup> although the words uttered by the *φωνὴ* are expressly given. Or, what comes to the same, *ἀκούειν* is supposed to mean in ix., “hearing;” in xxii., “understanding;”<sup>2</sup> whereas exactly in ix. it is said, *ἀκούοντες τῆς φωνῆς*, which in case of need might mean,

<sup>1</sup> As recently again, *Lange, Apost. Age*, i. 57, for whom, however, from the pinnacle of *a priori* construction of history on which he stands, remarks such as the above are naturally much too “rabbinical.”

<sup>2</sup> Thus *Neander* also, *History of the Planting, &c.*, p. 147.

understanding the voice ; on the contrary, xxii., *τὴν φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν*, which it is impossible to translate except as, they did not *hear*. The antagonistic statements as to what Paul's companions saw, might be more readily reconciled by the observation that they beheld the light indeed, but no distinct person or figure (*μηδένα*).<sup>1</sup> But it is not stated in any of the three accounts that Paul himself saw more than that light. Now as it is obviously implied (ix. 7) that his followers did not see the appearance which was visible to him, from which the voice proceeded, and as for this very reason they stood in perplexity (*ἐνεοί*), the meaning must be, that they did not see the very light which, according to xxii., they did see. But still more important is it, 3, that some of the words attributed to Jesus appearing in the vision (xxvi 16—18), are quoted in ix. 15 as a speech of Jesus to Ananias; in xxii. 15, 21, partly as a speech of Ananias, partly as a speech of Jesus in a second appearance to Paul,<sup>2</sup> whereas by the accordant statement of chapters ix. and xxii. Jesus in the apparition at Damascus said only, *Σαοὺλ, Σαοὺλ, τί με διώκεις*; and then, on Paul's inquiry who he was, *ἔγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς ὃν σὺ διώκεις*.<sup>3</sup> To deny this contradiction, with Baumgarten, is forbidden by the clearest evidence. It is, moreover, admitted, not removed, by Meyer's remark (on ix. 6), "that in the address to Agrippa, Paul concentrates the story, and attributes to the author of this com-

<sup>1</sup> Neander, Baumgarten on this passage, and others.

<sup>2</sup> xxvi. 16 f.: *εἰς τοῦτο γάρ ὡφθην σοι, προχειρίσασθαί σε ὑπηρέτην καὶ μάρτυρα ὃν τε εἶδες ὃν τε ὁφθήσομαι σοι· ἔξαιρούμενός σε ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τῶν θινῶν, εἰς οὐδὲ τῦν σε ἀποστέλλω.*

ix. 15 (speech of Jesus to Ananias). *πορεύον, ὅτι σκεύος ἐκλογῆς μοι ἵστιν οὗτος τοῦ βαστάσαι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐνώπιον ἐθνῶν καὶ βασιλέων νιῶν τε Ἰσραήλ.*

xxii. 15 (Ananias to Paul). *ὅτι ἔσῃ μάρτυρς αὐτῷ πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὃν ἐώρακας καὶ ἤκουσας.*

xxii. 21 (Jesus to Paul at Jerusalem). *πορεύον ὅτι ἔγώ εἰς ἔθνη μακρὰν ἔξαποστελῶ σε.*

<sup>3</sup> What further appears in ix., according to the earlier reading, is known to be a gloss from xxvi. It is, moreover, striking here that the *Greek* proverb, *πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν*, should occur in the *Hebrew* utterance of Jesus.

mand the commission which he received only later by the intervention of a mediator ;” and when he likewise asserts that the historical form alone, and not the thing itself, is thereby altered, it is difficult to comprehend it; where historical truth is concerned, the time when, the place where, the person by whom, anything was done or said, belong in fact to “the thing itself.”

The more recent commentators on the Acts are, as a rule, able to get over these variations easily by the observation that they concern merely subordinate adjuncts.<sup>1</sup> But they are not, after all, so entirely subordinate. In the first place, they cast a remarkable light on the historical character of this account. An author who is indifferent about relating one and the same fact in one and the same writing with incompatible adjuncts, must necessarily be so utterly dependent on extraneous accounts as to accept them unaltered, even when they contradict each other; or else he deals so freely with his historical material that he does not care for complete accordance and historical accuracy of detail; neither in one case nor the other shall we be able to call the writer a reliable historian. But here these adjuncts are far more closely connected with the nucleus of our narrative than is usually remarked. For in the uncertainty pervading all evidence from the subject of such a vision, it is only from the objective appearances connected with it that we can ascertain whether Paul beheld Jesus outwardly and really, or only inwardly with the eyes of the spirit; and for these objective appearances we are referred entirely to the testimony of his companions, which is recorded in the Acts alone. Now if their testimony appears so contradictory that we cannot clearly discern either the circumstances in which the witnesses received their impressions (standing or lying), nor the object of these impressions (an appearance of light, or a speech, and what speech), it is obvious that such evidence of authenticity is far from being what we necessarily require respecting every unusual event, and, above all, concerning one positively extraordinary and miraculous.

<sup>1</sup> For instance, *Neander*, p. 147. *Meyer*, on ix. 7.

If, then, our narrative becomes suspicious through these contradictory accounts, its internal constitution is entirely of a nature which, to every one who does not presuppose it unimpeachable, raises this suspicion to a conviction that it is not historical. The whole narrative is a continuous chain of miracles. The apparition of the glorified Christ is a miracle ; that this apparition was visible or audible to Paul alone is a second ; the blindness of Paul, a third ; the way in which it is relieved, a fourth ; finally, the visions of Paul and Ananias, a fifth and sixth. The naturalistic explanation of all these miracles, the thunder and lightning into which the apparition and the words of Jesus were transformed ; the blinding of Paul by the lightning or the fear ; his cure by the cold hands of old Ananias ; the psychological derivation of the two visions—these exploded feats of interpretation we may aptly pass by. It is obvious that they contradict the meaning of our author ; but granting this, it is incomparably more likely that the miraculous features of our narratives are void of all historical foundation, than that such extraordinary events, so unparalleled in their coincidence, afforded them a basis ; for here as little as in other cases can we agree to accept miracles. This is the more probable, the more easily in these cases all the features may be explained, partly by the analogy of similar narratives, partly by the pragmatism of the writer. The brilliant apparition of the Messiah was so directly suggested by the idea of his glorified state, that we can scarcely separate it from the original view of Paul. The case is essentially similar as to the words put into his mouth, for these words merely contain what was to be said on every occasion of the sort ; and that they are not quite authentically transmitted by our author may be seen by the deviating version of ch. xxvi. That Paul became blind in consequence of the apparition of Christ, is as little surprising as that Zachariah became dumb in consequence of the apparition of the angel ; for it is known that in the opinion of all the ancients and of the Jews especially, the appearances of higher beings produce an effect of that nature.

on mankind. But at the same time, this blindness and its cure are a very natural symbol of the spiritual condition of the Apostle before his conversion, and the transformation which now took place in him. That he was healed of his blindness by the Christ who had appeared to him, was only the same figurative expression of the fact of his conversion which we find in Isa. xlii. 7, xvi. 19, and often, and in our narrative itself in xxvi. 18.<sup>1</sup> If this expression was once understood literally, the blindness from which he was released could only be accounted for by the dazzling impression of the glorified Christ (Christophany).<sup>2</sup> Finally, as to the two visions, such appearances are too common with our author, as the narrative about Cornelius shows, and serve to introduce extraordinary occurrences, to prevent our surprise at their being brought into play on the present occasion. All these features may thus be easily understood without presupposing their objectivity ; the first two doubtless constituted part of Paul's actual vision ; the next two are the mythical expression of the fact of his conversion ; the last two belong to the pragmatism of the writer, and serve only as a motive for the connection of Ananias with Paul. This itself, irrespective of the visions and the miracles, might have been historical ; it is possible that Paul may have been first discovered and baptized by this Ananias at Damascus ; still we must not overlook the fact to which Schneckenburger<sup>3</sup> justly calls attention, that from his whole aim, still to be discussed, our author had a special interest in employing a man so avowedly pious in the law as was Ananias (according to xxii. 12), to introduce Paul into Christianity, and, what was in fact merely the mythical expression of this φωτισμός, to heal him of his blindness. It may therefore still be questioned whether Ananias took any part in the conversion of the Apostle, especially as the name was so

<sup>1</sup> Baptism is likewise called in the most ancient Church, φωτισμός.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. with this, *Baur*, Paul. p. 70.

<sup>3</sup> Zweck der Apg. pp. 168 f.

common,<sup>1</sup> and so well adapted to a messenger of divine grace, that it would have naturally occurred to an author who, for the sake of effect, required a specific name.

But now how does it stand with the main point itself, the outworks of which we have hitherto examined, with the apparition of Christ as such? One might doubt for a moment whether our author really wished to record an apparition of Christ (Christophany) in the strict sense of the word, a *personal* presence of the ascended Christ, and not a mere revelation of him by light and sound, without any personal appearance; for it is remarkable that in none of the three accounts is it explicitly said that Christ showed himself visibly, but mention is only made of the light which shone round him. And it seems that in his<sup>2</sup> opinion Paul saw with his eyes only this appearance, the Shechina of the Messiah, but not his form enveloped in brilliancy. This appears also in the description, ix. 3 ff., xxii. 6 ff.; for immediately on seeing the light Paul falls to the ground, so that he could see nothing more, and when he rises from the ground he is blind. Strictly speaking, we must therefore say that, according to the narrative of the Acts, Paul did not actually see Christ himself, but only his glory; and we cannot conceal from ourselves the deviation of this account from the Apostle's own, which, 1 Cor. ix. 1, xv. 8, unreservedly says, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐώρακα,<sup>2</sup> ὥφθη κάμοι. That this variation, however, is founded only on the later conceptions of the dazzling splendour of the glorified Christ, and that our author also imagined Christ to have been present in person in the apparition at Damascus, is shown by Paul's question, τίς εἰ, κύριε, as well as by the answer, ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς, &c.; likewise by the μηδένα, ix. 7; finally, by the distinct speech, ix. 17, 27, Ἰησοῦς ὁ ὀφθεῖσις σοι . . . ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ εἶδε τὸν κύριον. Paul saw Jesus, inasmuch as he saw

<sup>1</sup> The Acts alone know of two other Ananiases, v., xxiii. 2, xxiv. 1.

<sup>2</sup> That the vision here mentioned refers not to Acts xviii. 9, xxii. 17, but to the appearance before Damascus, is shown very well by Neander (p. 151) against Rückert.

the glory surrounding him ; but he did not see him as far as his personal form itself remained veiled. Now that Paul himself was convinced of the reality of this sight, cannot be doubted from the passages just quoted ; but it is another question, whether we have sufficient grounds for sharing this conviction. The final decision of the question certainly lies beyond the limits of purely historical investigation. Any one who admits no miracle, who doubts the reality of the resurrection of Jesus—in this we entirely agree with Neander (pp. 154 f.)—will also be unable to admit the miraculous apparition of the risen Jesus on the way to Damascus. On the other hand, any one who has this belief will be inclined to trust the evidence of the Apostle Paul respecting the appearance of the risen Lord vouchsafed to him. But this does not necessarily admit that historical criticism should be silent here, and abandon the whole question to doctrinal ideas alone. Whether miracles in general are possible or not, historical inquiry is certainly incapable of discovering ; but it is fully capable of examining whether the miracle in the present case is sufficiently corroborated to be considered probable according to the universally accepted principles of criticism. Now how does the case stand in this respect ? That an actual appearance of Christ here took place could be proved only by evidence, like any other fact—partly by Paul's own evidence, partly by that of his companions. That the latter does not suffice, however, we have already seen ; for, in the first place, it would not extend to the apparition itself, but only to the outward circumstances accompanying it ; and, in the second place, it is transmitted to us by such an unreliable third hand, and is so discordant in its individual parts, that it would be extremely frivolous, on a foundation so uncertain, to build one's faith on so extraordinary a fact, one so utterly beyond the range of all other experience. Incomparably more important is undoubtedly the Apostle's own statement. But yet, what strictly historical points can we derive from this statement ? In the first place, nothing

except that Paul was *convinced* that he had seen Christ; but whether he actually *did* see him would still need investigation. Or if we are willing to admit—but this is merely another expression of the same idea—that he *saw* Christ, i. e. that the image of the glorified Christ appeared to his mental perception with the force of present vision, it still remains a question whether this subjective appearance corresponded to an objective one, the vision of his internal to that of his external senses. Now how can this be proved? That there are visions to which no object corresponds, and that such merely inward visions also carry with them the distinctness and power of conviction of outward ones, is an undeniable fact; how can we know that it was otherwise with the vision of Paul on the way to Damascus? Whoever testifies to an apparition of this sort—this even Neander<sup>1</sup> is obliged to admit on another occasion—can only be reckoned a reliable witness of what he *believes* himself to perceive. Why should not this rule, justly asks Baur (p 65), be applied in the present case also? On these premises, rejoins Neander, the confident faith of Paul would have proceeded from a self-deception. “We cannot resolve to accept this if we are filled with *due respect* for this faith of Paul’s, and for that which it accomplished for the salvation of mankind.” But the fear of insulting the Apostle’s dignity is certainly no historical proof. Respect for the Apostle and his work, but, above all, respect for truth, demands nothing more urgently than that we should regard the Apostle only as that which he can be regarded on accredited testimony. These witnesses, his own Epistles, display him as a man of extremely excitable temperament, a man who, as he says himself (1 Cor. xiv. 18; 2 Cor. xii.; Gal. ii. 2), was to a peculiar degree disposed to visions and ecstatic states; why should we consider it impossible that such a one should have mistaken a vivid inward vision for an objective apparition? Because it is seen from 2 Cor. xii. that he was able to distinguish

<sup>1</sup> P. 128, with reference to the conversion of Cornelius.

ecstatic from other states (Neander, p. 154)? Much rather does it appear from this passage that he was by no means sure of the distinction, εἴτε ἐν σώματι ; he says, οὐκ οὖθα· εἴτε ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος, οὐκ οὖθα. ὁ θεὸς οὖθεν. But even granting that Paul was in general able to distinguish the condition of ecstasy from that of clear consciousness, as he certainly does in 1 Cor. xii.—xiv., does it follow that he was capable of sharply defining the *subjective* and the *objective* in his visions, the phenomena of the inward and the outward senses? Might he not then also consider that which he beheld in a state of ecstasy as something objective and real; and did he not consider it so in 2 Cor. xii.? In the present case, certainly not, thinks Neander, for then his confident faith would have proceeded from self-deception! But if it did, how many a faith, firm as a rock, has proceeded from self-deception! How many instances of similar self-deception are afforded by the history of the saints and the founders of religion; and what striking examples also even in the history of philosophy! What self-deception, for instance, in Socrates, to believe in a demoniacal voice within him! Why should not a like self-deception be possible in a Paul? Even in this case, however, his faith would not be founded on self-deception, but on his religious need: the vision which he certainly considered as objective was merely a consequence of this need; not the *foundation*, but the *effect* of his faith, or, more accurately, the manifestation of the faith breaking forth within him, the form in which he accounted to himself for his own consciousness, in which he passed from mere intuition to reality, from a vague impulse to a clear and firmly-grasped principle. We are of opinion that by such a representation of the affair, reverence for the Apostle is in no way injured.

But do we perchance encroach too nearly on psychological probability? Certainly, if it were supposed that Paul, without any inward preparation, by an entirely disconnected momentary excitement, evolved the apparition of Christ, that, as Meyer asserts (on ix. 3), "he was instantaneously seized by the marvellous

fact." But what justifies such a prodigious conception? Our text certainly ignores any doubts or struggles in the mind of Paul antecedent to his conversion; it makes the heavenly voice arrest him as he is panting with rage in his zeal for persecution. And what is the result as to the actual state of the case? We can therefore have no hope of obtaining any disclosure respecting the mental condition of the Apostle previous to his conversion. The task is here no other than to re-convert into a natural and historically probable illumination the occurrence which our book has transformed into a miraculous light. But neither is an *a-priori* reason capable of showing that "previous hesitations and mental conflicts were highly improbable in such a pure, firm and ardently decided character as Saul's; that for the transformation of his fixed conviction into one opposed to it, by the simple decision of his will, the direct action of the Divine power upon his inner man was requisite."<sup>1</sup> Just because Paul's was a pure character, he cannot have assumed the part of a persecutor without hesitation and scruples of conscience; just because he was a man of firm and ardent will, he cannot have escaped severe struggles before he found his moral and religious fulcrum. Or were not Paul's great kindred spirits, of whose spiritual conflicts we know so much, an Augustine and a Luther, likewise pure, decided and ardent characters? Nay, has not a trace been preserved of the conflict which he fought with himself as a Jew, zealous of the Law, in that remarkable passage of the Epistle to the Romans, vii. 7—25, which, it is true, is not immediately intended to describe his individual experiences, but in whose warm and animated representation there is an unmistakable echo of the remembrance of something personally endured? The more the probability of such internal conflicts and preparations increases on closer consideration, the more does the probability of external miracle diminish; and even if our knowledge of the Apostle's mental condition should not suffice completely to explain their course and portray it to us in every respect, it

<sup>1</sup> Meyer, in the work cited.

nevertheless remains, from an historical point of view, far more probable, under all circumstances, that it had its natural grounds of explanation, than that it should have been produced by a fact so unexampled as the apparition of Christ in our narrative.<sup>1</sup>

After his conversion, the Acts, ix. 19 ff., further relates that Paul remained a certain time (*ἡμέρας τινὰς*) at Damascus, and forthwith appeared in the synagogues, professing faith in Jesus; after a sojourn of some length (*ἡμέραι ἵκαναι*), an attempt at assassination by the Jews compelled him to fly; he went to Jerusalem, but was first shunned by the Christians there, until Barnabas introduced him to the Apostles; he was now received into their society, and actively supported them in proclaiming the Gospel. A new plot of assassination decided him to abandon Jerusalem also, and to return to his native city Tarsus.

This account it is impossible to reconcile in parts with the Apostle's own statements in the Epistle to the Galatians, in parts with the later representation of our book. According to Gal. i. 16, Paul went immediately (*εὐθέως*) after his conversion to Arabia, returned again to Damascus, and visited Jerusalem only after an interval of three years. On this journey to Arabia, the Acts is not only completely silent, but it leaves no space vacant for it. Commentators, in the difficulty of finding one, have tried every possible point, but nowhere has a gap been discovered large enough to receive it. Pearson wanted to interpose it between verses 18 and 19. But if to the end of verse 18 the subject consists of Paul's experiences at Damascus, and verse 19 continues, "he was certain days with the disciples at Damascus," this cannot possibly be understood otherwise than that the sojourn at Damascus, previously mentioned, lasted for some time. Others place the journey between the *ἡμέρας τινὰς*, verse 19, and the appearance in the synagogues, verse 20, which is forbidden even by the *καὶ εὐθέως* at the begin-

<sup>1</sup> Restricting ourselves to the criticism of the Acts, we are the less inclined to enter here on a more minute analysis of the internal conditions which may have produced the vision of Paul, as, after all, only conjectures are possible on this subject, and no assertions susceptible of historical proof.

ning of the 20th verse, and altogether by the perfectly uninterrupted course of the narrative. Kuinol (on verses 19, 25) and Olshausen make the Apostle go to Arabia only after his flight from Damascus, between verses 25 and 26. This opinion would be refuted by the εὐθέως alone, Gal. i. 16; but it also conflicts with the account of our book; for when it is said, verse 25, that Paul fled from Damascus, and verse 26 directly continues, "and when he came to Jerusalem," the meaning can only be that he went direct from Damascus to Jerusalem; not that leaving that city on one side he first made a great journey to the south, and thence, after an indefinite period, returned to Jerusalem. It need only be mentioned how improbable it is, moreover, that Paul, having hardly escaped from the men of the Arabian Prince Aretas (2 Cor. xi. 32 f.; comp. Acts ix. 23 ff.), should have turned especially to Arabia. It is most feasible to transfer, with Neander (p. 157), this Arabian journey to the ἡμέραι ικαναὶ of our 23rd verse. Nevertheless, here again the εὐθέως of the Epistle to the Galatians stands in the way. How could the Apostle say that he went to Arabia immediately after his call, without previous conference with others, if he had first sojourned for some time with the Christians at Damascus, and had here begun to preach the Gospel? But obviously our author does not think of leaving room in verse 23 for the Arabian journey. Only read his account, verse 22: "But Saul increased the more in strength, and confounded the Jews which dwelt at Damascus, proving that this is very Christ. And after that many days were fulfilled, the Jews took counsel to kill him." Here it is evident that the "many days" represent the time of the ministry at Damascus, and that the words, ὡς ἐπληροῦντο ἡμέραι ικαναὶ, imply a protracted sojourn in *Damascus*, not in Damascus and Arabia. It cannot be said that the latter lasted so short a time as to be omitted in this connection; a journey of at least fifty miles was at that time no such small affair; and if Paul once undertook it, he can scarcely have remained a very short time in Arabia. But how little our account in any way agrees with

that of the Epistle to the Galatians is best seen in the remark in verse 26, that on the arrival of Paul at Jerusalem the Christians did not believe in his conversion, and avoided him for that reason. "How could this have been possible," inquires Baur, with good cause (p. 107), "if a period of more than three years had already elapsed since the conversion of the Apostle, if he had then laboured in behalf of the Gospel, not only far off in Arabia, but also at Damascus, and during a protracted period had given so many actual proofs of the alteration which had taken place in him"? What Neander rejoins (p. 165), in order to vindicate the account of the Acts, is extremely unsatisfactory: "The difficulty might be diminished if we bear in mind that the youth Saul need not then have been of such great importance, that he had spent the greater part of those three years subsequent to his conversion in seclusion in Arabia, and also the interruption of intercourse owing to political circumstances and the war with King Aretas. It might also be possible that Barnabas served him as a mediator, although he may not have required his mediation for the particular object of overcoming the mistrust of the faithful." This latter possibility we may lay aside for the present, as it is not available at any rate for those who hold to our text, which says in plain words, that all the Christians in Jerusalem feared Paul, because they did not credit his conversion, and Barnabas first introduced him to the Apostles. How little there is to recommend Neander's further arguments, is seen at once by transporting oneself for a moment into the circumstances in question. The first persecution broke out against the youthful Christian Church; not only in Jerusalem, but in all Palestine and beyond it, its members are filled with alarm, and men and women are dragged to judgment. At the head of the persecutors stands Paul; he is in the act of carrying the persecution to Damascus also, when all at once he crosses to the side of his opponents, palpably and openly proclaims himself in the schools of Damascus an advocate of the cause of which he had hitherto been the mortal enemy, and

drives the Jews hard into a corner with proofs of the divine mission of Jesus. Who in the world will believe that such an important and extraordinary event can have remained unknown to the Christians in Jerusalem for three years, that no tidings of it should have reached Jerusalem from Damascus, with which it maintained the briskest intercourse, and which was inhabited by an extremely numerous Jewish population ; or if such knowledge is to be assumed, in spite of our 27th verse, that Paul's conduct at Damascus should not have overcome all doubt of his sincerity ? How weak in comparison are Neander's evasions ! " Saul need not then have been of any great importance ;" when not only by the Acts, viii. 3, ix. 1 f., but by himself also, he is represented as the most vehement and conspicuous opponent of the Christian community. " He spent in Arabia the greater part of the three years subsequent to his conversion ;" when we have only just learnt from Neander that the journey to Arabia was merely a cursory episode to his sojourn at Damascus. " The war with Aretas interrupted the intercourse ;" when, as Neander says himself, p. 160, Aretas was assuredly not in possession of Damascus for three years, and he was moreover (as we have seen above, by his procedure against Paul) so partial to the Jews that he could not have thought of checking their intercourse with Jerusalem, and especially the three annual festival caravans.<sup>1</sup> What does it mean, then, when Neander prudently observes that although the extent of the period between the conversion of Paul and his first journey to Jerusalem was not accurately known to the writer of the Acts, no contrariety can be discovered with the Apostle's own calculation ? That Paul says he only went to Jerusalem after the lapse of three years ; the Acts, that he went there before anything was known of the occurrence at Damascus, which after three years must necessarily have long been known ; —this is of course no contradiction !

<sup>1</sup> Still less could this have been the case if Damascus, according to Wieseler's otherwise improbable hypothesis (Chronology of the Acts, pp. 167 ff.), had passed by gift under Arabian dominion and remained in this condition during a lengthened period.

In Jerusalem, Paul, according to our 27th verse, was brought to the Apostles ( $\pi\rho\delta\tau\alpha\varsigma\alpha\sigma\tau\delta\lambda\omega\nu$ ), with whom he now associated for some time. In Gal. i. 18 f. the Apostle himself asseverates with solemn protestations ( $\delta\gamma\rho\acute{a}\phi\omega\,\dot{\iota}\mu\hat{\iota}\nu$ ,  $\dot{\iota}\delta\delta\omega\,\dot{\iota}\nu\omega\pi\tau\iota\nu$ ) that he went to Jerusalem to see Peter, but that of the other Apostles he saw none, save James, the Lord's brother. That here again there is an unsolvable contradiction, even Neander,<sup>1</sup> p. 165, was obliged to admit (when Baur<sup>2</sup> had pointed it out); that there is here not mere ignorance of the special circumstances is improbable, to begin with, as it can scarcely be supposed that the author of the Acts was unacquainted with the Epistle to the Galatians; but we shall certainly be able to assert it more positively when we have examined the remaining deviations of our narrative from Paul's own account. The whole of the Apostle's sojourn at Jerusalem is placed by himself in an essentially different light from what it is in our book; which only allows us to imagine a somewhat lengthened stay in the city named, the object of which we can scarcely seek in anything but the promulgation of the Gospel. In the Epistle to the Galatians, not only is the object of the journey to Jerusalem otherwise defined ( $\iota\sigma\tau\sigma\pi\eta\sigma\alpha\,\Pi\acute{e}r\pi\nu$ ), but the duration of the sojourn at Jerusalem is limited to fourteen days. Now the Epistle to the Galatians certainly does not explicitly say that Paul did not preach the Gospel in Jerusalem, and the Acts as little explicitly that he stayed more than fourteen days; but that the intention is nothing else is obvious. "I went to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fourteen days, but other of the Apostles saw I none;"—this sounds quite different from the account in the Acts: "Barnabas brought Saul to the Apostles, and he was with them coming in and going out at Jerusalem ( $\dot{\iota}\nu\,\mu\acute{e}\tau'\,\alpha\dot{\iota}\tau\hat{\iota}\nu\,\epsilon\iota\sigma\pi\sigma\pi\eta\mu\acute{e}\nu\omega\varsigma\,\kappa\acute{a}\,\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\pi\sigma\pi\eta\mu\acute{e}\nu\omega\varsigma\,\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ )

<sup>1</sup> The Acts also, according to viii. 1, comp. with xi. 1, xv., imagine the Twelve persistently assembled at Jerusalem.

<sup>2</sup> Paul. p. 110, wherewith compare, of earlier writers, Gfrörer, Die heilige Sage, i. 418; Schrader (Paul. v.) on our passage; Schneckenburger, Zweck der Apg. p. 167.

‘Ιερουσαλήμ), and spoke boldly in the name of Jesus.” Respecting a visit of fourteen days, which moreover regarded Peter alone, assuredly neither the author of the Acts nor any other sensible writer would have expressed himself thus. Even the murderous proposal of the Hellenists (Acts ix. 29) postulates a more protracted sojourn, or it must be supposed that Paul, quite contrary to his usual custom, employed the first days after his arrival in making himself mortal enemies by indiscreet vehemence. The less, however, the two accounts admit of reconciliation in the cases quoted, so much the more undisguised appears the object of the alterations which our author has allowed himself to make. The account of the Epistle to the Galatians has the avowed purpose of proving Paul’s independence of all human authority, and especially of the influence of the primitive Apostles. But this is just what the author of the Acts does *not* want; his narrative is therefore reversely planned, so as to bring Paul from the commencement into the closest connection with the Twelve, and with the Jewish people. Hence the silence respecting the journey to Arabia; hence the curtailment of the three years which elapsed between the Apostle’s conversion and his first visit to Jerusalem; hence the prolongation of his sojourn in this city; hence the extension of the *two* Apostles whom Paul really saw into the Apostles; hence the fabulous intercourse with the Apostles, which is unknown to the Epistle to the Galatians; hence the preaching of the Gospel at Jerusalem, which is improbable in itself, and is especially a mere copy of the preaching of Stephen.<sup>1</sup> When all the undeniably unhistorical features in which a later account deviates from the original one are so simply explained by one and the same motive, it is certainly in the highest degree probable that the cause of these deviations is to be sought in this very motive.

If, however, any doubt as to this should still exist, it must

<sup>1</sup> Verse 29: ἐλάλει τε καὶ συνεζήτει πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλληνιστὰς, οἱ δὲ ἐπεχείρουν αὐτὸν ἀνέλειν. Similarly it is the Hellenists, vi. 9, who, disputing with Stephen (*συζητοῦντες*) and vanquished by him, cause his death.

needs vanish when we add to our passage the further statement of xxvi. 19 f. After the apparition at Damascus, Paul here says : οὐκ ἐγενόμην ἀπειθῆς τῇ οὐρανῷ ὀπτασίᾳ· ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἐν Δαμασκῷ πρῶτον καὶ Ἱεροσολύμοις, εἰς πᾶσάν τε τὴν χώραν τῆς Ἰουδαίας, καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ἀπήγγελον μετανοεῖν. He therefore asserts, that previous to his ministry among the heathen,<sup>1</sup> he laboured not only in Jerusalem, but in *all* Judæa, as a preacher of the Gospel. It is obvious that this was not really the case, and it is not the Epistle to the Galatians alone which excludes such a comprehensive ministry in Judæa, but the Acts also leaves (ix. 28 ff.) no space for it; for in xxii. it tells of the explicit admonition of Jesus to the Apostle, to refrain from labouring among his fellow-countrymen, and to address himself without delay to the heathen. Even if, in defiance of the text, later missionary labours should be contemplated in xxvi. 20,<sup>2</sup> the few places which Paul touched in his journeys to Jerusalem, the short distance from Samaria or Cæsarea to the capital could only with great exaggeration be termed πᾶσα ἡ χώρα τῆς Ἰουδαίας, not to mention that neither does the Acts say anything of missionary enterprizes made by Paul at these places. But the less the historic truth of this statement can be thought of, the more indicative is it of our author. How the modest, almost supplicatory appendix, τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, disappears here behind the ostentatious ἐν Δαμασκῷ καὶ Ἱεροσολύμοις εἰς πᾶσάν τε τὴν χώραν τῆς Ἰουδαίας, the great historical ministry of the Apostle of the Gentiles behind the fabled mission to the Jews! And what an aspect does this offer us of the historical fidelity and aim of our book!

Of the same origin and character is the statement of our work respecting the cause of the Apostle's departure from Jerusalem. That this statement has no historical value is incontrovertibly proved by the contradiction in which the author has involved himself respecting it. According to ix. 29 f., the departure of

<sup>1</sup> This appears partly from the πρότον, partly from the position of the parts of the sentence.

<sup>2</sup> Baumgarten, ii. b. 325.

Paul is occasioned by a plot of assassination by Hellenistic Jews; in xxii. 17 ff. Paul himself relates instead that, while he was in the Temple, Jesus appeared to him, and commissioned him to leave Jerusalem speedily, as his witness would gain no credence there.<sup>1</sup> The relative position of these two accounts is not supplementary, but mutually exclusive. On the basis of the 9th chapter, the apparition of Christ mentioned in the 22nd could only be attributed to the moment at which the scheme of assassination against Paul was already matured; for after he had received the reiterated command (xxii. 18, 21) to depart quickly from Jerusalem, he could not have engaged in further polemical discussions with the Hellenists, and have thus exasperated them. But it is then extremely remarkable that the speech of Christ to the Apostle makes no allusion to the danger hanging over him, but finds the command to depart only on the *prospective* unsusceptibility of the people of Jerusalem. If, on the contrary, on account of this circumstance the apparition of Christ be placed earlier than the scheme of assassination and the conduct of Paul which occasioned it, the latter could no longer be explained after such a distinct command to depart. The two accounts cannot therefore be reconciled; each is much more adapted singly to explain the departure of the Apostle from Jerusalem, without requiring the other to complete it, or even allowing room for it. Their common tendency is obviously this: to give an appearance of reluctance to Paul's separation

<sup>1</sup> That this vision cannot be transferred to the time of his later stay in Jerusalem, xi. 30, as Thiersch wishes (The Church in the Apostolic Age, 119), is incontrovertibly clear from the context of the passage. "As I went to Damascus (verse 6), Christ appeared to me in person; when I came again to Jerusalem (verse 17), he appeared again to me in a vision." Who in all the world would thus express himself, if his meaning is rather that, long after his return from the journey to Damascus, in a subsequent visit to Jerusalem, Christ appeared to him? Moreover, Paul could not (xi. 30) for the first time have been sent to the Gentiles, among whom he had long been, and from whom he was only despatched to Jerusalem on a temporary commission; and it was then neither necessary to tell him not to devote himself to the ministry in Jerusalem, nor was objection to such a command to be expected from him. Such harmonistic perversions can only serve to make the impossibility of reconciling the statements clearer than before.

from the original Apostles and the limitation of his ministry to the Gentile world. For this purpose two ways were open : Paul might be driven to the course he took either by a higher command or by the resistance of the Jews ; in one case, as in the other, he was justified before those who took offence, at his confining himself to the Gentile world. That our author should take both ways at once, without thinking of their discordance, throws a remarkable light on his character as an historian and a writer ; but one statement is undoubtedly as little historical as the other;<sup>1</sup> the Epistle to the Galatians only allows us to conjecture that Paul, from the first, had not contemplated any lengthened sojourn at Jerusalem.

<sup>1</sup> Quite erroneous is the opinion of *Wieseler* (*Chronology of the Apostolic Age*, 162 ff ), that the apparition in xxii. coincides with that mentioned in 1 Cor. xii. 2 ff ; it is surely quite different both in its form and purport. Even by this, the hypothesis would gain nothing in favour of the truth of the narrative in Acts xxii.

END OF VOL. I.



# A Catalogue of Williams & Norgate's Publications

---

## Divisions of the Catalogue

	PAGE
I. THEOLOGY . . . . .	3
II. PHILOSOPHY, PSYCHOLOGY . . . . .	29
III ORIENTAL LANGUAGES, LITERATURE, AND HISTORY	34
IV. PHILOLOGY, MODERN LANGUAGES . . . . .	39
V. SCIENCE, MEDICINE, CHEMISTRY, ETC. . . . .	45
VI. BIOGRAPHY, ARCHÆOLOGY, LITERATURE, MISCELLANEOUS . . . . .	56

*FULL INDEX OVER PAGE*

---

London  
Williams & Norgate  
14 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, W.C.

# INDEX.

- Abyssinia, Shihab al Din,** 37.  
**Agricultural Chemical Analysis, Wiley,** 55.  
**Alcyonium, Liverpool Mar. Biol. C. Membs.,** 48, 49.  
**Americans, The, Munsterberg,** 30.  
**Anarchy and Law, Brewster,** 29.  
**Anatomy, Cunningham Memoirs,** 46.  
 Surgical, of the Horse, 49.  
**Antedon, Liverpool Marine Biol. Membs.,** 49.  
**Anthropology, Prehistoric, Avebury,** 56; **Engelhardt,** 57.  
 Evolution of Religion, Farnell, 12.  
**Aurida, Liverpool Marine Biol. Membs.,** 49.  
**Apocalypse, Bleek,** 8; **Clark,** 17.  
**Apostles and Apostolic Times, Dobschütz,** 4; **Hausrath,** 19; **Weinel,** 4; **Weissäcker,** 7; **Zeller,** 9.  
 Statutes of, edit G. Horner, 26.  
**Apostolic Succession, Clark,** 17.  
**Arabic Grammar, Socin,** 37.  
 Poetry, *Fassullah Bhai*, 35; *Lyall*, 35, *Nöideke*, 36.  
**Ascidia, Liverpool Marine Biol. Membs.,** 48.  
**Assyrian, Dictionary, Muss-Arnolt,** 36; **Norris,** 36.  
 Grammar, *Delitzsch*, 34.  
 Language, *Delitzsch*, 34.  
**Assyriology, Brown,** 56; *Delitzsch*, 10, 34; *Evans*, 35; *Sayce*, 15; *Schrader*, 9.  
**Astigmatic Tests, Pray,** 52; *Snellen*, 54.  
**Astronomy, Cunningham Membs., V,** 46; *Memoirs of Roy. Astronom. Soc.*, 62.  
**Atom, Study of, Venable,** 55.  
**Augustine, St., Confessions of, Harnack,** 18.  
**Babylonia, see Assyriology.**  
 Belief, Religious, *Upton*, 15.  
**Beneficence, Negative and Positive, Spencer,** Principles of Ethics, II, 31.  
**Bible, 16.**  
*See also Testament.*  
 Beliefs about, *Savage*, 25.  
*Hebrew Texts*, 19.  
 History of Text, *Weir*, 27.  
 Plants, *Henslow*, 19.  
 Problems, *Cheyne*, 11.  
**Bibliography, Bibliographical Register,** 56.  
**Biology, Bastian,** 45; *Liverpool Marine Biol. Membs.*, 48, 49; *Spencer*, 31.  
**Botany, Jour. of the Linnean Soc.**, 48.  
**Brain, Cunningham Membs., VII,** 46.  
**Buddha, Buddhism, Davids,** 14; *Hardy*, 35; *Oldenberg*, 36.  
**Calculus, Harnack,** 47.  
**Canons of Athanasius, Text & Trans Soc.**, 38.  
**Cardium, Liverpool Marine Biol. Membs.,** 48.  
**Celtic, see also Irish.**  
*Sullivan*, 42.  
 Heathendom, *Rhys*, 15.  
**Ceremonial Institutions, Spencer, Prince of Sociology,** II, 31.  
**Chaldee, Grammar, Turpie,** 38.  
 Lexicon, *Fuerst*, 35.  
 Chemistry, *Van't Hoff*, 47; *Hart*, 47; *Noyes*, 51; *Mulliken*, 51; *Venable*, 55.  
**Chemist's Pocket Manual,** 49.  
**Christ, Early Christian Conception of, Pfleiderer,** 11, 23.  
 Life of, *Kern*, 8.  
 No Product of Evolution, *Henslow*, 29.  
 Study of, *Robinson*, 24.  
 Teaching of, *Harnack*, 6, 11.  
 The Universal, *Beard*, 16.  
**Christianity, Evolution of, Gell,** 18.  
 Expansion of, *Harnack*, 4.  
 History of, *Baur*, 8; *Dobschütz*, 4; *Harnack*, 6, 11, 18; *Hausrath*, 8, 19; *Johnson*, 20; *Wernle*, 4.  
 in Talmud, *Herford*, 19.  
 Liberal, *Riville*, 10.  
 Primitive, *Pfleiderer*, 3, 23.  
 Simplest Form of, *Drummond*, 24.  
 What is? *Harnack*, 6, 11.  
**Church, Catholic, Renan,** 14.  
 Catholic, A Free, 26.  
 Christian, *Baur*, 8; *Clark*, 17; *Dobschütz*, 4; *Hatch*, 14; *Wernle*, 4.  
 Christian, Sacerdotal Celibacy in, 21.  
 Coming, *Hunter*, 20.  
 History of, *von Schubert*, 3, 25.  
**Codex Palatino-Vaticanus, Todd Lectures,** III., 43.  
**Codium, Liverpool Marine Biol. Membs.,** 49.  
 Communion of Christian with God, *Herrmann*, 6, 20.  
**Comte, Spencer,** 32.  
 Constellations, Primitive, *Brown*, 56.  
 Creed, *Christian*, 16.  
**Crown Theological Library,** 10.  
 Cuneiform, Inscriptions, *Schrader*, 9.  
 Daniel and His Prophecies, *C H H. Wright*, 28. and its Critics, *C H H. Wright*, 28.  
 Danish Dictionary, *Rosing*, 42.  
 Darwinism, *Schurman*, 30.  
 Denmark, *Engelhardt*, 57.  
 Doctrine and Principle, *Beeby*, 16.  
 Dogma, History of, *Harnack*, 5  
 of Virgin Birth, *Lobstein*, 10.  
 Domestic Institutions, *Spencer*, Prince of Sociology, I, 31.  
**Duck Tribes, Morphology of, Cunningham Membs., VI,** 46.  
**Dutch, Cape, Oordt,** 42; *Werner*, 43.  
**Dynamics, Cunningham Membs., IV,** 46.  
 Chemical, *Van't Hoff*, 47.  
**Ecclesiastes, Taylor,** 26.  
**Ecclesiastical Institutions, Spencer, Prince of Sociology,** III, 31.  
 of Holland, *Wicksteed*, 27.  
**Echinus, Liverpool Marine Biol. Membs.,** 49.  
 Economy, Political, *Mackenzie*, 29.  
**Education, Herbert,** 57; *Lodge*, 41; *Spencer*, 32; *Hagmann*, 40.  
 Educational Works, *see* Special Catalogue.

## INDEX—Continued.

- Egypt, Religion of, *Renouf*, 25.  
 Egyptian Grammar, *Erman*, 34.  
 Electric Furnace. The, *Moisson*, 51.  
 Electrolytic Laboratories, Arrangements of, 51.  
 Engineering Chemistry, *Stillman*, 54.  
 Enoch, Book of, *Gill*, 18.  
 Epidemiology, *Trans. of Epidemiolog. Soc.*, 55.  
 Epizootic Lymphangitis, Treatise on, *Patin*, 51.  
 Ethics, Early Christian, 25  
 and Religion, *Martineau*, 22.  
 Data of, *Spencer*, Principles of E., I., 31.  
 Individualism and Collectivism, 30.  
 Induction of, *Spencer*, Principles of E., I., 31.  
 Kantian, *Schurman*, 30  
 of Evolution, *Schurman*, 30.  
 of Individual Life, *Spencer*, Princ. of E., I., 31.  
 of Reason, *Laurie*, 29  
 Principles of, *Spencer*, 31.  
 Ethiopic, Grammar, 34.  
 Ethnology, *Cunningham Mem.*, X., 46.  
 Evolution, *Spencer*, 31, 32.  
 of the Idea of God, *D'Alviella*, 14.  
 of Religious Thought, *D'Alviella*, 15.  
 Exodus, *Hoernlein*, 20.  
 Ezekiel, *Mosheh ben Shesheth*, 22.  
 Faith, *Herrmann*, 11; *Rix*, 24, *Wimmer*, 27.  
 Fisheries, British, *Johnstone*, 47  
 Flinders Petrie Papyri, *Cunningham Mem.*,  
 VIII, IX, 46.  
 Flora of Edinburgh, *Sonntag*, 54.  
 French, *Boiselle*, 40; *Delbos*, 40, *Eugène*, 40;  
*Hugo*, 41, 42; *Roget*, 42; also Special  
 Education Catalogue.  
 Literature, *Roget*, 42.  
 Novels, *Army Series*, 39.  
 Gammars, *Liverpool Marine Biol. Mem.*, 49  
 Genesis, *Hebrew Texts*, 19, 35, *Wright, C H H*, 28.  
 Geography, Ancient, *Kiepert*, 58  
 Geometry, Analytical, Elements of, 47.  
 German Literature, *Nibelungenlied*, 41, *Philippss*,  
 42.  
 Novels, *Army Series*, 39.  
 Germany, *Marcks*, 58.  
 God, Idea of, *D'Alviella*, 14.  
 Gospel, Fourth, *Drummond*, 17, *Taylor*, 26.  
 Social, *Harnack and Herrmann*, 13, 19  
 Gospels, Old and New Certainty, *Robinson*, 24.  
 Greek, Modern, *Zompolides*, 44.  
 Gymnastics, Medical, *Schreber*, 53.  
 Hebrew, Biblical, *Kennedy*, 35.  
 Language, *Deltsasch*, 34.  
 Lexicon, *Fuerst*, 35.  
 New School of Poets, *Albrecht*, 36.  
 Scriptures, *Sharpe*, 25.  
 Story, *Peters*, 23.  
 Synonyms, *Kennedy*, 35.  
 Text of O.T., *Weis*, 27.  
 Texts, 19, 35.  
 Hebrews, History of, *Kittel*, 6; *Peters*, 11; *Sharpe*, 25.  
 Hebrews. Religion of, *Kuenen*, 9; *Montefiore*, 24.  
 Heterogenesis, *Bastian*, 45.  
 Hibbert Lectures, 14, 15.
- Horse, Life-size Models of, 48.  
 Hygiene: Practical, *Handbook of*, 45.  
 Hymns, *Jones*, 20.  
 Icelandic, *Lilja*, 41; *Viga Glums Saga*, 43.  
 Dictionary, *Zoëga*, 44.  
 Grammar, *Bayldon*, 39.  
 Individualism, *Spencer*, Man v. State, 32.  
 Infinitesimals and Limits, 47.  
 Irish, *Hogan*, 40; *Leabhar Breac*, 41; *Leabhar na H-Uidhri*, 41; *O'Grady*, 42; *Todd Lectures*, 42; *Yellow Book of Lecan*, 44.  
 Isalah, *Hebrew Texts*, 19, 35.  
 Israel, History of, *Kittel*, 6; *Peters*, 23; *Sharpe*, 25.  
 Religion of, *Kuenen*, 9.  
 in Egypt, *Wright, C H H*, 28.  
 Jeremiah, *Mosheh ben Shesheth*, 22.  
 Jesus, *Keim*, 8.  
 The Real, *Vickers*, 27.  
 Times of, *Hausrath*, 8.  
 See also Christ.  
 Job, Book of, *Ewald*, 8; *Hebrew Text*, 19, 35;  
*Wright, C. H H*, 28.  
 Rabbinical Comment. on, *Text & Trans. Soc.*, 38.  
 Justice, *Spencer*, Prince of Ethics, II., 31, 32.  
 Kant, *Schurman*, 30.  
 Kindergarten, *Goldammer*, 57.  
 Knowledge, Evolution of, *Perrin*, 23, 30.  
 Labour, *Harrison*, 57, *Schloss*, 59; *Vynne*, 60.  
 Leabhar Breac, 41; *Hogan*, 40.  
 Life and Matter, *Lodge*, 22.  
 Ligia, *Liverpool Marine Biol. Mem.*, 49.  
 Liverpool, History of, *Muir*, 58.  
 Lives of the Saints, *Hogan*, 40.  
 Logarithms, *Sang*, 53, *Schroen*, 53; *Vega*, 55.  
 London Library Catalogue, 57.  
 Lumbar Curve, *Cunningham Mem.*, II., 46.  
 Mahabharata, *Sørensen*, 37.  
 Malaria, *Annett*, 45, *Boyce*, 45; *Dutton*, 46;  
*Mems. of Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine*, 49; *Ross*, 52; *Stephens*, 54.  
 Maori, Dictionary, *Williams*, 43.  
 Manual, *Maori*, 41.  
 Materialism, *Martineau*, 22.  
 Mathematics, *Harnack*, 47.  
 See also Logarithms.  
 Medieval Thought, *Poole*, 23.  
 Mesca Ulad, *Todd Lectures*, I., 42.  
 Metallic Objects, Productions of, 52.  
 Metaphysics, *Laurie*, 29.  
 Mexico, Religions of, *Réville*, 15.  
 Micah, Book of, *Taylor*, 26.  
 Microscopy, *Journal of the Roy. Micro. Soc.*, 48;  
*Journal of the Qinetick Micro. Club*, 48.  
 Midrash, Christianity in, *Herford*, 19.  
 Molecular Weights, Methods of Determining, 45.  
 Monasticism, *Harnack*, 18.  
 Moorhouse Lectures, 22.  
 Mosquitoes, *Mems. of Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine*, 50.  
 Municipal Government, A History of, in Liverpool, 59.  
 Mythology, Greek, *Brown*, 56.  
 Northern, *Stephens*, 59.

## INDEX—Continued.

- National Idealism and a State Church, 17.  
 Naturalism and Religion, Otto, 12.  
 Nautical Terms, *Delbos*, 40.  
 Nennius, The Irish, *Hogan*, 40.  
 New Guinea, *Cunningham Memos.*, X., 40.  
 Newman, Mystery of, 16.  
 New Testament Times, *Hausrath*, 8, 19.  
 Norwegian Dictionary, *Rosing*, 42.  
 Ophthalmic Tests, *Pray*, 52; *Snellen*, 54.  
 Optical Convention, Proceedings of, 52.  
 Ores, Methods for the Analysis of, 52.  
 Organic Analysis, Elementary, 45.  
 Origins, Christian, *Johnson*, 20  
     of Religion, *Hibbert Lectures*, 14, 15.  
 Pall, *Dipavansha*, 34; *Milanda Pankha*, 36;  
     *Vinaya Pitakam*, 38.  
     Handbook, *Frankfurter*, 35.  
     Miscellany, 36.  
 Pathology, Inflammation Idea in, *Ransom*, 52.  
 Paul, St., *Bauer*, 8; *Pfeifferer*, 9, *Weinel*, 4.  
 Periodic Law, *Venable*, 55.  
 Persian, *Avesta Pahlavi*, 34.  
     Grammar, *Platts*, 37.  
 Peru, Religions of, *Réville*, 15.  
 Philo Judaeus, *Drummond*, 29.  
 Philosophy, 29  
     and Experience, *Hodgson*, 29  
     Jewish Alexandrian, *Drummond*, 29  
     of Religion, *Pfeifferer*, 9.  
     Reorganisation of, *Hodgson*, 29.  
     Religion of, *Perrin*, 23  
     Synthetic, *Collins*, 29, *Spencer*, 31  
 Political Institutions, *Spencer*, Princ. of Sociology, II., 31.  
 Portland Cement, *Meade*, 49.  
 Pottery, *Seger's*, Writings on, 53.  
 Prayers, *Common Prayer*, 17, *Jones*, 21, *Personal*, 23; *Sadler*, 25; *Ten Services*, 26.  
 Prehistoric Man, *Avebury*, 56, *Engelhardt*, 57.  
 Printing at Brescia, *Peddie*, 59.  
 Professional Institutions, *Spencer*, Princ. of Sociology, III., 31.  
 Profit-sharing, *Schloss*, 59.  
 Prophets of O.T., *Ewald*, 8.  
 Protestant Faith, *Herrmann*, 12; *Réville*, 11.  
 Psalms, *Hebrew Texts*, 19, 35  
     and Canticles, *Ten Services*, 26.  
     Commentary, *Ewald*, 8.  
 Psychology, *Scripture*, 30, *Wundt*, 33.  
     of Belief, *Pihler*, 30.  
     Principles of, *Spencer*, 31.  
 Reconciliation, *Henslow*, 19.  
 Reformation, *Beard*, 14.  
 Religion, Child and, 11.  
     History of, *Kuennen*, 9, 14; *Réville*, 9, 15.  
     and Naturalism, Otto, 12.  
     of Philosophy, *Perrin*, 23.  
     Philosophy of, *Pfeifferer*, 9.  
     Struggle for Light, *Wimmer*, 10.  
     See also Christianity, History of  
 Religions, National and Universal, *Kuennen*, 21.  
     of Authority, *Sabatier*, 4.  
 Resurrection, *Lake*, 13; *Macan*, 22, *Marchant*, 22.  
 Reviews and Periodical Publications, 61.  
 Rigveda, *Wallis*, 38.  
 Rome, *Renan*, 14.  
 Runes, *Stephens*, 59.  
 Ruth, *Wright, C. H. H.*, 28.  
 Sanitation, in Cape Coast Town, *Taylor*, 54.  
     in Para, *Notes*, 51.  
 Sanscrit, *Abhidhanaratnamala*, 34; *Sørensen*, 37.  
 Sermons, *Beard*, 16; *Broadbent*, 16.  
     Addresses, and Essays, 24.  
 Services, *Common Prayer*, 17; *Jones*, 21; *Ten Services*, 26.  
 Silva Gadilica, *O'Grady*, 42.  
 Social Dynamics, *Mackenzie*, 29.  
     Statics, *Spencer*, 32.  
 Sociology, Descriptive, *Spencer*, 32.  
     Principles of, *Spencer*, 31.  
     Study of, *Spencer*, 32.  
 Soils and Fertilisers, 54.  
 Solomon, Song of, *Réville*, 24.  
 South Place Ethical Society, *Conway*, 17.  
 Spanish Dictionary, *Velasquez*, 43.  
 Spinal Cord, *Bruce*, 46.  
 Sternum, *Paterson*, 51.  
 Storms, *Paddington*, 52.  
 Sun Heat, *Cunningham Memos*, III., 46.  
 Surgery, System of, *von Bergmann*, 45.  
 Syriac, *Bernstein*, 34; *Dietrich*, 34, *Nöldeke*, 36.  
 Taal, Afrikaner, *Oordt*, 42, *Werner*, 43.  
 Talmud, Christianity in, *Hersford*, 19.  
 Tennyson, *Weld*, 60.  
 Tent and Testament, *Rix*, 24.  
 Testament, New, Apologetic of, 13.  
     Books of, *Von Soden*, 26.  
     Commentary, Protestant Commentary, 9.  
     Luke the Physician, 13, 18.  
     Textual Criticism, *Nestle*, 7.  
     Times, *Hausrath*, 8, 19.  
     See also Gospels.  
 Testament, Old, Cuneiform Inscriptions, *Schrader*, 9.  
     Introduction to the Canonical Books of, 3, 27.  
     Literature of, *Kautsch*, 21.  
     Religion of, *Marti*, 13, 22.  
 Test Types, *Pray*, 52; *Snellen*, 54.  
 Theism, *Voysey*, 27.  
 Theological Translation Library, 3.  
 Theology, History of, *Pfeifferer*, 9.  
     New, Sermons, *R. J. Campbell*, 16.  
 Thermometer, History of, 45.  
 Trypanosomiasis, *Dutton*, 47.  
 Urine Analysis, Text-book of, 49.  
 Virgil, *Henry*, 57.  
 Virgin Birth, *Lobstein*, 10.  
 Weissmann, *Spencer*, 32.  
 Woman's Labour, *Englishwoman's Review*, 61;  
     *Harrison*, 57, *Vynne*, 59.  
 Suffrage, *Blackburn*, 56.  
 Yellow Fever, *Durham*, 50.  
 Zoology, *Journal of the Linnean Soc.*, 48; *Liverpool Marine Biology Comm. Memos.*, 48-49.

# I. Theology and Religion.

---

## THEOLOGICAL TRANSLATION LIBRARY.

### New Series.

*A Series of Translations by which the best results of recent Theological Investigations on the Continent, conducted without reference to doctrinal considerations, and with the sole purpose of arriving at the truth, are placed within reach of English readers.*

---

Vols. I.—XII. were edited by the Rev. T. K. Cheyne, M.A., D.D., Oriel Professor of Interpretation in the University of Oxford, Canon of Rochester; and the late Rev. A. B. Bruce, D.D., Professor of Apologetics, Free Church College, Glasgow.

Vol. XIII. was edited by Rev. Allan Menzies, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in the University, St Andrews.

Vols. XV., XVII., XVIII., and XXI.—XXIV. are edited by Rev. W. D. Morrison, M.A., LL.D.

Vols. XIX. and XX. are edited by Rev. James Moffatt, B.D., D.D., St Andrews.

*The Price of Vols. I.—XXI. is 10s. 6d.;*

*Vol. XXII. and after, 10s. 6d. net.*

Subscribers to the Series obtain three volumes for **22s. 6d.** carriage free, payable before publication, which only applies to the current year's volumes, viz., XXII.—XXIV., which are as follows:—

Vol. XXII. Ready. 10s. 6d. net.

**PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY, Vol. I : Its Writings and Teachings in their Historical Connections.** By Otto Pfeiderer, Professor of Practical Theology in the University of Berlin.

Vol. XXIII. Ready. 10s. 6d. net.

**THE INTRODUCTION TO THE CANONICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.** By Carl Cornill, Professor of Old Testament Theology at the University of Breslau.

Vol. XXIV. Ready. 10s. 6d. net.

**HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.** By Hans von Schubert, Professor of Church History at Kiel. Translated from the Second German Edition. By arrangement with the author, an Additional Chapter has been added on "Religious Movements in England in the Nineteenth Century," by Miss Alice Gardner, Lecturer and Associate of Newnham College, Cambridge.

---

THEOLOGICAL TRANSLATION LIBRARY—Continued.

The following Volumes are published at 10s. 6d. per Volume.  
Vol. XXI.

**ST PAUL: THE MAN AND HIS WORK.** By Prof. H. Weinel of the University of Jena. Translated by Rev. G. A. Bienemann, M.A. Edited by Rev. W. D. Morrison, M.A., LL.D.

"Prof. Weinel may be described as the Dean Farrar of Germany; the work is quite equal to Dean Farrar's work on the same subject. In some respects it is better."—*Daily News*.

Vols. XIX. and XX.

**THE EXPANSION OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.** By Adolf Harnack, Ordinary Professor of Church History in the University, and Fellow of the Royal Academy of the Sciences, Berlin; translated and edited by James Moffatt, B.D., D.D., St Andrews. Vol. I. being out of print.

"It is bare justice to say that in the present monograph, the outcome of his preliminary studies in the Berlin Academy's transactions for 1901, Harnack has once more brilliantly shown his power of combining verve and learning, mastery of salient detail, and an outlook upon the broad movements of the period in question. The 'Ausbreitung' forms a sequel and supplement to works like his own 'Wesen' and Weizsäcker's 'Apostolic Age.' It is a diagnosis rather than a story, yet an analysis in which eloquent facts lose little or nothing of their eloquence"—*Hibbert Journal*.

Vol. XVIII.

**CHRISTIAN LIFE IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.** By Ernst von Dobschütz, D.D., Professor of New Testament Theology in the University of Strassburg. Translated by Rev. G. Bremner, and edited by the Rev. W. D. Morrison, LL.D.

"It is only in the very best English work that we meet with the scientific thoroughness and all-round competency of which this volume is a good specimen; while such splendid historical veracity and outspokenness would hardly be possible in the present or would-be holder of an English theological chair."—Dr RASHDALL in *The Speaker*.

"Some may think that the author's finding is too favourable to the early churches; but, at any rate, there is no volume in which material for forming a judgment is so fully collected or so attractively presented."—*British Weekly*.

Vol. XVI.

**THE RELIGIONS OF AUTHORITY AND THE RELIGION OF THE SPIRIT.** By the late Auguste Sabatier, Professor of the University of Paris, Dean of the Protestant Theological Faculty. With a Memoir of the Author by Jean Réville, Professor in the Protestant Theological Faculty of the University of Paris, and a Note by Madame Sabatier.

"Without any exaggeration, this is to be described as a great book, the finest legacy of the author to the Protestant Church of France and to the theological thought of the age. Written in the logical and lucid style which is characteristic of the best French theology, and excellently translated, it is a work which any thoughtful person, whether a professional student or not, might read without difficulty."—*Glasgow Herald*.

## THEOLOGICAL TRANSLATION LIBRARY—Continued.

Vols. XV. and XVII.

**THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY.** By Paul Wernle, Professor Extraordinary of Modern Church History at the University of Basel. Revised by the Author, and translated by the Rev. G. A. Bienemann, M.A., and edited, with an Introduction, by the Rev. W. D. Morrison, LL.D.

Vol. I. *The Rise of the Religion.*Vol. II. *The Development of the Church.**From some of the Reviews of the Work.*

Dr Marcus Dods in the *British Weekly*—“We cannot recall any work by a foreign theologian which is likely to have a more powerful influence on the thought of this country than Wernle's *Beginnings of Christianity*. It is well written and well translated; it is earnest, clear, and persuasive, and above all it is well adapted to catch the large class of thinking men who are at present seeking some non-miraculous explanation of Christianity.”

“No English book covers the same ground, or is conceived with the same breadth and sanity; in few works in any language are learning and insight so happily combined.”—*Edinburgh Review*.

“The translation is well done, and the book is full of interest.”—*Athenaeum.*

The Earlier Works included in the Library are:—

**HISTORY OF DOGMA.** By Adolf Harnack, Ordinary Professor of Church History in the University, and Fellow of the Royal Academy of the Sciences, Berlin. Translated from the Third German Edition. Edited by the Rev. Prof. A. B. Bruce, D.D. 7 vols. (New Series, Vols. II., VII., VIII., IX., X., XI., XII.) 8vo, cloth, each 10s. 6d.; half-leather, suitable for presentation, 12s. 6d.

ABBREVIATED LIST OF CONTENTS:—Vol. I.: INTRODUCTORY DIVISION:—I. Prolegomena to the Study of the History of Dogma. II. The Presuppositions of the History of Dogma. DIVISION I.—The Genesis of Ecclesiastical Dogma, or the Genesis of the Catholic Apostolic Dogmatic Theology, and the first Scientific Ecclesiastical System of Doctrine. Book I.:—*The Preparation.* Vol. II.: DIVISION I. Book II.:—*The Laying of the Foundation.*—I. Historical Survey.—I. *Fixing and gradual Secularising of Christianity as a Church.*—II. *Fixing and gradual Hellenising of Christianity as a System of Doctrine.* Vol. III.: DIVISION I. Book II.:—*The Laying of the Foundation*—continued. DIVISION II.—The Development of Ecclesiastical Dogma. Book I.:—*The History of the Development of Dogma as the Doctrine of the God-man on the basis of Natural Theology.* A.—*Presuppositions of Doctrine of Redemption or Natural Theology.* B.—*The Doctrine of Redemption in the Person of the God-man in its historical development.* Vol. IV.: DIVISION II. Book I.—*The History of the Development of Dogma as the Doctrine of the God-man on the basis of*

**THEOLOGICAL TRANSLATION LIBRARY—Continued.**

*Natural Theology*—continued. Vol. V.: DIVISION II. BOOK II.—*Expansion and Remodelling of Dogma into a Doctrine of Sin, Grace, and Means of Grace on the basis of the Church*. Vol. VI.: DIVISION II. BOOK II.—*Expansion and Remodelling of Dogma into a Doctrine of Sin, Grace, and Means of Grace on the basis of the Church*—continued. Vol. VII.: DIVISION II. BOOK III.—*The Threefold Issue of the History of Dogma*.—Full Index.

"No work on Church history in recent times has had the influence of Prof. Harnack's *History of Dogma*."—*Times*.

"A book which is admitted to be one of the most important theological works of the time."—*Daily News*.

**WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY?** Sixteen Lectures delivered in the University of Berlin during the Winter Term, 1899–1900. By Adolf Harnack. Translated by Thomas Bailey Saunders. (New Series, Vol. XIV.) Demy 8vo, cloth, 10s. 6d.; half-leather, suitable for presentation, 12s. 6d.

Prof. W. Sanday of Oxford, in the examination of the work, says:—"I may assume that Harnack's book, which has attracted a good deal of attention in this country as in Germany, is by this time well known, and that its merits are recognised—its fresh and vivid descriptions, its breadth of view and skilful selection of points, its frankness, its genuine enthusiasm, its persistent effort to get at the living realities of religion."

"Seldom has a treatise of the sort been at once so suggestive and so stimulating. Seldom have the results of so much learning been brought to bear on the religious problems which address themselves to the modern mind."—*Pilot*.

"In many respects this is the most notable work of Prof. Harnack. . . . These lectures are most remarkable, both for the historical insight they display and for their elevation of tone and purpose."—*Literature*.

**THE COMMUNION OF THE CHRISTIAN WITH GOD: A Discussion in Agreement with the View of Luther.** By W. Herrmann, Dr. Theol., Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the University of Marburg. Translated from the Second thoroughly revised Edition, with Special Annotations by the Author, by J. Sandys Stanyon, M.A. (New Series, Vol. IV.) 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d.

"It will be seen from what has been said that this book is a very important one. . . . The translation is also exceedingly well done."—*Critical Review*.

"We trust the book will be widely read, and should advise those who read it to do so twice."—*Primitive Methodist Quarterly*.

"Instinct with genuine religious feeling; . . . exceedingly interesting and suggestive."—*Glasgow Herald*.

**A HISTORY OF THE HEBREWS.** By R. Kittel, Ordinary Professor of Theology in the University of Breslau. In 2 vols. (New Series, Vols. III. and VI.) 8vo, cloth. Each volume, 10s. 6d.

Vol. I. *Sources of Information and History of the Period up to the Death of Joshua*. Translated by John Taylor, D.Lit., M.A.

## THEOLOGICAL TRANSLATION LIBRARY—Continued.

Vol. II. Sources of Information and History of the Period down to the Babylonian Exile. Translated by Hope W. Hogg, B.D., and E. B. Speirs, D.D.

"It is a sober and earnest reconstruction, for which every earnest student of the Old Testament should be grateful."—*Christian World*.

"It will be a happy day for pulpit and pew when a well-thumbed copy of the *History of the Hebrews* is to be found in every manse and parsonage."—*Literary World*.

"It is a work which cannot fail to attract the attention of thoughtful people in this country."—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

## AN INTRODUCTION TO THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT.

By Professor Eberhard Nestle, of Maulbronn. Translated from the Second Edition, with Corrections and Additions by the Author, by William Edie, B.D., and edited, with a Preface, by Allan Menzies, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in the University of St Andrews. (New Series, Vol. XIII.) With eleven reproductions of Texts. Demy 8vo, 10s. 6d.; half-leather, 12s. 6d.

"We have no living scholar more capable of accomplishing the fascinating task of preparing a complete introduction on the new and acknowledged principles than Prof. Nestle. This book will stand the most rigorous scrutiny, it will surpass the highest expectation."—*Expository Times*.

"Nothing could be better than Dr. Nestle's account of the materials which New Testament textual criticism has to deal with."—*Spectator*.

"We know of no book of its size which can be recommended more cordially to the student, alike for general interest and for the clearness of its arrangement. . . . In smoothness of rendering, the translation is one of the best we have come across for a considerable time."—*Manchester Guardian*.

## THE APOSTOLIC AGE. By Prof. Carl von Weizsäcker. Translated by James Millar, B.D. 2 vols. (New Series, Vols. I. and V.) Demy 8vo, cloth. Each 10s. 6d.

"Weizsäcker is an authority of the very first rank. The present work marks an epoch in New Testament criticism. The English reader is fortunate in having a masterpiece of this kind rendered accessible to him."—*Expository Times*.

". . . No student of theology or of the early history of Christianity can afford to leave Weizsäcker's great book unread."—*Manchester Guardian*.

"In every direction in this work we find the mark of the independent thinker and investigator . . . this remarkable volume . . . this able and learned work. . . ."—*Christian World*.

"The book itself . . . is of great interest, and the work of the translation has been done in a most satisfactory way."—*Critical Review*.

**THEOLOGICAL TRANSLATION FUND LIBRARY.**  
**Old Series.**

*Uniform Price per Volume, 6s.*

**BAUR (F. C.). CHURCH HISTORY OF THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.** Translated from the Third German Edition. Edited by Rev. Allan Menzies. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. 12s.

— **PAUL, THE APOSTLE OF JESUS CHRIST, HIS LIFE AND WORK, HIS EPISTLES AND DOCTRINE.** A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity. Edited by Rev. Allan Menzies. 2nd Edition. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. 12s.

**BLEEK (F.). LECTURES ON THE APOCALYPSE.** Translated. Edited by the Rev. Dr. S. Davidson. 8vo, cloth. 6s.

**EWALD'S (Dr. H.) COMMENTARY ON THE PROPHETS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.** Translated by the Rev. J. F. Smith. [Vol. I. General Introduction, Yoel, Amos, Hosea, and Zakharya 9–11. Vol. II. Yesaya, Obadya, and Mikah. Vol. III. Nahûm, Ssephanya, Habaqqûq, Zakhârya, Yéremya. Vol. IV. Hezekiel, Yesaya xl.–lxvi. Vol. V. Haggai, Zakharya, Malaki, Jona, Baruc, Daniel, Appendix and Index.] 5 vols. 8vo, cloth. 30s.

— **COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS.** Translated by the Rev. E. Johnson, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. 12s.

— **COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF JOB, with Translation.** Translated from the German by the Rev. J. Frederick Smith. 8vo, cloth. 6s.

**HAUSRATH (Prof. A.). HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT TIMES.** The Time of Jesus. Translated by the Revs. C. T. Poynting and P. Quenzer. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. 12s.

The second portion of this work, "The Times of the Apostles," was issued apart from the Library, but in uniform volumes; *see p. 19.*

**KEIM'S HISTORY OF JESUS OF NAZARA:** Considered in its connection with the National Life of Israel, and related in detail. Translated from the German by Arthur Ransom and the Rev. E. M. Geldart. [Vol. I. Second Edition. Introduction, Survey of Sources, Sacred and Political Groundwork, Religious Groundwork. Vol. II. The Sacred Youth, Self-recognition, Decision. Vol. III.

**THEOLOGICAL TRANSLATION FUND LIBRARY—Continued.**

The First Preaching, the Works of Jesus, the Disciples, and Apostolic Mission. Vol. IV. Conflicts and Disillusions, Strengthened Self-confidence, Last Efforts in Galilee, Signs of the Approaching Fall, Recognition of the Messiah. Vol. V. The Messianic Progress to Jerusalem, the Entry into Jerusalem, the Decisive Struggle, the Farewell, the Last Supper. Vol. VI. The Messianic Death at Jerusalem. Arrest and Pseudo-Trial, the Death on the Cross, Burial and Resurrection, the Messiah's Place in History, Indices.] Complete in 6 vols. 8vo. 36s.

(Vol. I. only to be had when a complete set of the work is ordered.)

**KUENEN (Dr. A.). THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL TO THE FALL OF THE JEWISH STATE.** By Dr. A. Kuenen, Professor of Theology at the University, Leiden. Translated from the Dutch by A. H. May. 3 vols. 8vo, cloth. 18s.

**PFLEIDERER (O.). PAULINISM: A Contribution to the History of Primitive Christian Theology.** Translated by E. Peters. 2nd Edition. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. 12s.

— **PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION ON THE BASIS OF ITS HISTORY.** (Vols. I. II. History of the Philosophy of Religion from Spinoza to the Present Day; Vols. III. IV. Genetic-Speculative Philosophy of Religion.) Translated by Prof. Allan Menzies and the Rev. Alex. Stewart. 4 vols. 8vo, cloth. 24s.

**RÉVILLE (Dr. A.). PROLEGOMENA OF THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS.** With an Introduction by Prof. F. Max Müller. 8vo, cloth. 6s.

**PROTESTANT COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.** With General and Special Introductions. Edited by Profs. P. W. Schmidt and F. von Holzendorff. Translated from the Third German Edition by the Rev. F. H. Jones, B.A. 3 vols. 8vo, cloth. 18s.

**SCHRADER (Prof. E.). THE CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.** Translated from the Second Enlarged Edition, with Additions by the Author, and an Introduction by the Rev. Owen C. Whitehouse, M.A. 2 vols. (Vol. I. not sold separately.) With a Map. 8vo, cloth. 12s.

**ZELLER (Dr. E.). THE CONTENTS AND ORIGIN OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES CRITICALLY INVESTIGATED.** Preceded by Dr. Fr. Overbeck's Introduction to the Acts of the Apostles from De Wette's Handbook. Translated by Joseph Dare. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. 12s.

**THE CROWN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.**

*The volumes are uniform in size (crown octavo) and binding, but the price varies according to the size and importance of the work.*

**A Few Opinions of the Series.**

Professor Marcus Dods : "By introducing to the English-speaking public specimens of the work of such outstanding critics and theologians, your 'Crown Theological Library' has done a valuable service to theological learning in this country."

Dr John Watson : "The Library is rendering valuable service to lay theologians in this country, as well as to ministers."

Rev. Principal P. T. Forsyth : "As a whole it is an admirable series, and opens to the English reader at a low price some books which are of prime importance for religious thought."

Sir Edward Russell : "I have formed the highest opinion of this series. Each of the books is animated by a fine intelligent and at the same time devout spirit."

Rev. Principal D. L. Ritchie : "I have read many of the volumes in the 'Crown Library,' and I think it an admirable and useful series."

Rev Professor A. E. Garvie : "I am very grateful for the publication of these volumes, as they bring within the reach of the English student, in a correct translation and at cheap price, important theological works, which otherwise would be accessible only to those familiar with French or German."

Rev. R. J. Campbell : "Your 'Crown Theological Library' is invaluable, and is doing excellent service for liberal Christianity."

Professor G. Currie Martin : "I think you are rendering a most valuable service to all serious students of theology by your publication of the 'Crown Theological Library.'"

---

**Vol. I. BABEL AND BIBLE.** By Dr. Friedrich Delitzsch, Professor of Assyriology in the University of Berlin. Authorised Translation. Edited, with an Introduction, by Rev. C. H. W. Johns. Crown 8vo, with 77 illustrations, cloth. 5s.

**Vol. II. THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF CHRIST: An Historical and Critical Essay.** By Paul Lobstein, Professor of Dogmatics in the University of Strassburg. Translated by Victor Leuhette, A.K.C., B.-ès-L., Paris. Edited, with an Introduction, by Rev. W. D. Morrison, LL.D. Crown 8vo. 3s.

**Vol. III. MY STRUGGLE FOR LIGHT: Confessions of a Preacher.** By R. Wimmer, Pastor of Weisweil-am-Rhein in Baden. Crown 8vo, cloth. 3s. 6d.

**Vol. IV. LIBERAL CHRISTIANITY: Its Origin, Nature, and Mission.** By Jean Réville, Professeur adjoint à la Faculté de Théologie Protestante de l'Université de Paris. Translated and edited by Victor Leuhette, A.K.C., B.-ès-L. Crown 8vo, cloth. 4s.

**THE CROWN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY—Continued.**

- Vol. V. WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY?** By Adolf Harnack, Professor of Church History in the University, Berlin. Translated by Thomas Bailey Saunders. Crown 8vo. 5s.
- Vol. VI. FAITH AND MORALS.** By W. Herrmann, Professor of Systematic Theology at the University of Marburg; Author of "The Communion of the Christian with God." Crown 8vo, cloth. 5s.
- Vol. VII. EARLY HEBREW STORY.** A Study of the Origin, the Value, and the Historical Background of the Legends of Israel. By John P. Peters, D.D., Rector of St Michael's Church, New York; author of "Nippur, or Explorations and Adventures on the Euphrates." Crown 8vo, cloth. 5s.
- Vol. VIII. BIBLE PROBLEMS AND THE NEW MATERIAL FOR THEIR SOLUTION. A Plea for Thoroughness of Investigation addressed to Churchmen and Scholars.** By the Rev. T. K. Cheyne, D.Litt., D.D., Fellow of the British Academy; Oriel Professor of Interpretation in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Rochester. Crown 8vo. 5s.
- "The work is remarkably interesting and learned . . . those who wish to understand what problems are likely to engage attention in the near future ought not to neglect the book."—*British Friend*.
- Vol. IX. THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT AND ITS HISTORICAL EVOLUTION; and RELIGION AND MODERN CULTURE.** By the late Auguste Sabatier, Professor in the University of Paris. Translated by Victor Leuliette, A.K.C., B.-ès-L. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.
- " . . . Both the studies in the volume are profoundly interesting; marked everywhere by the piercing insight, philosophic grasp, and deep spirituality which are characteristic of this great and lamented Christian thinker."—*The Christian World*
- Vol. X. THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CONCEPTION OF CHRIST: Its Value and Significance in the History of Religion.** By Otto Pfleiderer, D.D., Professor of Practical Theology in the University, Berlin. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- "It would be difficult to name any recent English work which could compare with this brilliant essay as a concise but lucid presentation of the attitude of the more advanced school of German theologians to the Founder of the Christian religion."—*Scotsman*.
- Vol. XI. THE CHILD AND RELIGION: Eleven Essays.** By Prof. Henry Jones, M.A., LL.D., University of Glasgow; C. F. G. Masterman, M.A.; Prof. George T. Ladd, D.D., LL.D., University of Yale; Rev. F. R. Tennant, M.A., B.Sc., Hulsean Lecturer; Rev. J. Cynddylan Jones, D.D.; Rev. Canon Hensley Henson, M.A.; Rev. Robert F. Horton, M.A.,

**THE CROWN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY—Continued.**

D.D.; Rev. G. Hill, M.A., D.D.; Rev. J. J. Thornton; Rev. Rabbi A. A. Green; Prof. Joseph Agar Beet, D.D. Edited by Thomas Stephens, B.A. Crown 8vo. 6s.

"No fresher and more instructive book on this question has been issued for years, and the study of its pages will often prove a godsend to many perplexed minds in the church and in the Christian home."—*British Weekly*.

**Vol. XII. THE EVOLUTION OF RELIGION: an Anthropological Study.** By L. R. Farnell, D.Litt., Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College, Oxford; University Lecturer in Classical Archaeology, etc., etc. Crown 8vo, cloth. 5s.

"It is one of the most valuable volumes that have appeared in this excellent series. He gives so clear and lucid a picture of the actual results of anthropology that his book is certainly the one we should put in the hands of students"—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

**Vol. XIII. THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.** By H. Von Soden, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin. Translated by the Rev. J. R. Wilkinson, and edited by Rev. W. D. Morrison, LL.D. Crown 8vo, cloth. 5s.

**Vol. XIV. JESUS.** By Wilhelm Bousset, Professor of Theology in Gottingen. Translated by Janet Penrose Trevelyan, and edited by Rev. W. D. Morrison, LL.D. Crown 8vo. 4s.

"It is true the writers, Von Soden and Bousset, have, in the course of their papers, said things that I regard as nothing less than admirable. I very much doubt whether we have anything so admirable in English."—Rev. Dr. Sanday in the *Guardian*.

**Vol. XV. THE COMMUNION OF THE CHRISTIAN WITH GOD.** By Prof. Wilhelm Herrmann. Translated from the new German Edition by Rev. J. S. Stanyon, M.A., and Rev. R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc. Crown 8vo, cloth. 5s.

**Vol. XVI. HEBREW RELIGION TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF JUDAISM UNDER EZRA.** By W. E. Addis, M.A. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 5s.

"It would be difficult to name a book better adapted to give the student a clear and reliable impression of the results of recent research into the origin and historical development of Hebrew religion."—*Scotsman*.

**Vol. XVII. NATURALISM AND RELIGION.** By Rudolf Otto, Professor of Theology in the University of Gottingen. Translated by J. Arthur Thomson, Professor of Natural History in the University of Aberdeen, and Margaret R. Thomson. Edited with an Introduction by Rev. W. D. Morrison, LL.D. Crown 8vo. 6s.

"A valuable survey, and a critical estimate of scientific theory and kindred ideas as they concern the religious view of the world. . . . It is well written, clear, and even eloquent."—*Expository Times*.

## THE CROWN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY—Continued.

- Vol. XVIII. ESSAYS ON THE SOCIAL GOSPEL.** By Professor Adolf Harnack, of Berlin, and Professor W. Herrmann, of Marburg. Crown 8vo, cloth. 4s. 6d.

"Herrmann's Essay on 'The Moral Teaching of Jesus' is profoundly interesting and suggestive. He agrees with Harnack that the conception which rules in the Gospel precepts on social questions of an approaching end of the world, must modify in an important degree the meaning we read into them, and the lessons we derive from them. Altogether the volume, which has been excellently translated, is well deserving the attention of English students of social and religious questions."—*The Christian World*.

- Vol. XIX. THE RELIGION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT:** Its Place among the Religions of the Nearer East. By Karl Marti, Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, Bern. Crown 8vo, cloth. 4s. 6d.

In a leading review *The Spectator* says:—"It is a valuable contribution to a great theme by one who has devoted his life to its study. Not only the general reader, for whom it is specially intended, but the theologian will learn not a little from its pages."

- Vol. XX. LUKE, THE PHYSICIAN.** By Adolf Harnack, D.D. Translated by the Rev. J. R. Wilkinson, M.A. Crown 8vo, cloth. 6s.

"What is new and interesting and valuable is the ratiocination, the theorising, and the personal point of view in the book under review. We study it to understand Professor Harnack, not to understand Luke; and the study is well worth the time and work. Personally, I feel specially interested in the question of Luke's nationality. On this the author has some admirable and suggestive pages."—Prof. Sir W. M. Ramsay in *The Expositor*.

- Vol. XXI. THE HISTORICAL EVIDENCE FOR THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST.** By Kirsopp Lake, Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the University of Leiden, Holland. Crown 8vo, cloth. 5s.

- Vol. XXII. THE APOLOGETIC OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.** By E. F. Scott, M.A., author of "The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Theology." Crown 8vo, cloth. 5s.

*Nearly Ready.*

- Vol. XXIII. THE SAYINGS OF JESUS.** By Adolf Harnack, D.D. Being Vol. II. of Dr Harnack's New Testament Studies. Crown 8vo, cloth. 6s.

(Vol. III. of these Studies will be added to the Library, but the title has not yet been decided upon.)

---

### THE HIBBERT LECTURES.

Library Edition, demy 8vo, 10s. 6d. per volume. Cheap Popular Edition, 3s. 6d. per volume.

**ALVIELLA** (Count GOBLET D'). **EVOLUTION OF THE IDEA OF GOD, ACCORDING TO ANTHROPOLOGY AND HISTORY.** Translated by the Rev. P. H. Wicksteed. (Hibbert Lectures, 1891.) Cloth. 10s. 6d. Cheap Edition, 3s. 6d.

**BEARD** (Rev. Dr. C.). **LECTURES ON THE REFORMATION OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY IN ITS RELATION TO MODERN THOUGHT AND KNOWLEDGE.** (Hibbert Lectures, 1883.) 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d. Cheap Edition, 3s. 6d.

**DAVIDS** (T. W. RHYS). **LECTURES ON SOME POINTS IN THE HISTORY OF INDIAN BUDDHISM.** (Hibbert Lectures, 1881.) 2nd Edition. 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d. Cheap Edition, 3s. 6d.

**DRUMMOND** (Dr.). **VIA, VERITAS, VITA.** Lectures on Christianity in its most Simple and Intelligible Form. (The Hibbert Lectures, 1894.) 10s 6d Cheap Edition, 3s. 6d.

**HATCH** (Rev. Dr.). **LECTURES ON THE INFLUENCE OF GREEK IDEAS AND USAGES UPON THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.** Edited by Dr. Fairbairn. (Hibbert Lectures, 1888.) 3rd Edition. 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d. Cheap Edition, 3s. 6d.

**KUENEN** (Dr. A.). **LECTURES ON NATIONAL RELIGIONS AND UNIVERSAL RELIGION.** (The Hibbert Lectures, 1882.) 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d. Cheap Edition, 3s. 6d.

**MONTEFIORE** (C. G.). **ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF RELIGION AS ILLUSTRATED BY THE RELIGION OF THE ANCIENT HEBREWS.** (The Hibbert Lectures, 1892.) 2nd Edition. 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d. Cheap Edition, 3s. 6d.

**PFLEIDERER** (Dr. O.). **LECTURES ON THE INFLUENCE OF THE APOSTLE PAUL ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIANITY.** Translated by the Rev. J. Frederick Smith. (Hibbert Lectures, 1885.) 2nd Edition. 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d. Cheap Edition, 3s. 6d.

**RENAN** (E.). **ON THE INFLUENCE OF THE INSTITUTIONS, THOUGHT, AND CULTURE OF ROME ON CHRISTIANITY, AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.** Translated by the Rev. Charles Beard. (Hibbert Lectures, 1880.) 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d. Cheap Edition, 3rd Edition, 3s. 6d.

## THE HIBBERT LECTURES—Continued.

**RENOUF (P. LE PAGE).** ON THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT EGYPT. (Hibbert Lectures, 1879.) 3rd Edition. 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d. Cheap Edition, 3s. 6d.

**RHYS (Prof. J.).** ON THE ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF RELIGION AS ILLUSTRATED BY CELTIC HEATHENDOM. (Hibbert Lectures, 1886.) 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d. Cheap Edition, 3s. 6d.

**RÉVILLE (Dr. A.).** ON THE NATIVE RELIGIONS OF MEXICO AND PERU. Translated by the Rev. P. H. Wicksteed. (Hibbert Lectures, 1884.) 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d. Cheap Edition, 3s. 6d.

**SAYCE (Prof. A. H.).** ON THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT ASSYRIA AND BABYLONIA. 4th Ed. (Hibbert Lectures, 1887.) 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d. Cheap Ed., 3s. 6d.

**UPTON (Rev. C. B.).** ON THE BASES OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF. (Hibbert Lectures, 1893.) Demy 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d. Cheap Edition, 3s. 6d.

## ALPHABETICAL LIST.

**ADDIS (W. E.).** HEBREW RELIGION. *See* Crown Theological Library, p. 12.

**ALLIN (Rev. THOS.).** UNIVERSALISM ASSERTED AS THE HOPE OF THE GOSPEL ON THE AUTHORITY OF REASON, THE FATHERS, AND HOLY SCRIPTURE. With a Preface by Edna Lyall, and a Letter from Canon Wilberforce. Crown 8vo. Sewed, 1s. 6d. net; cloth, 2s. 6d. net.

**ALVIELLA (Count GOBLET D').** THE TEMPORARY EVOLUTION OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN ENGLAND, AMERICA, AND INDIA. Translated from the French by the Rev. J. Moden. 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d.

— EVOLUTION OF THE IDEA OF GOD. *See* The Hibbert Lectures, p. 14.

**ANNOTATED CATECHISM.** A Manual of Natural Religion and Morality, with many practical details. 2nd Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth. 1s.

**BAUR (F. C.).** CHURCH HISTORY OF THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES. *See* Theological Translation Library, Old Series, p. 8.

— PAUL, THE APOSTLE OF JESUS CHRIST. *See* Theological Translation Library, Old Series, p. 8.

## ALPHABETICAL LIST—Continued.

- BEARD (Rev. Dr. C.). THE UNIVERSAL CHRIST, AND OTHER SERMONS.** Crown 8vo, cloth. 7s. 6d.
- **LECTURES ON THE REFORMATION OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY IN ITS RELATION TO MODERN THOUGHT AND KNOWLEDGE.** *See* The Hibbert Lectures, p. 14.
- BEEBY (Rev. C. E., B.D., Author of "Creed and Life"). DOCTRINE AND PRINCIPLES.** Popular Lectures on Primary Questions. Demy 8vo, cloth. 4s. 6d.
- BIBLE.** Translated by Samuel Sharpe, being a Revision of the Authorised English Version. 6th Edition of the Old, 10th Edition of the New Testament. 8vo, roan. 5s. *See also* Testament.
- BLEEK (F.). LECTURES ON THE APOCALYPSE.** *See* Theological Translation Library, Old Series, p. 8.
- BREMOND (HENRI).** **THE MYSTERY OF NEW-MAN.** With an Introduction by Rev. George Tyrrell, M.A. Medium 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d net.
- "From France comes a remarkable volume, excellently translated, which endeavours to probe the mystery ; to realise, as it were, the soul of Newman, to describe to us justly and truthfully the personality of the man."—*Daily Chronicle*
- "No subsequent work can deprive M Bremond's book of its great psychological interest ; it is a work that, unlike many books on Newman and the Tractarians, no student of modern Christianity can afford to miss."—*Pall Mall Gazette*.
- BROADBENT (The late Rev. T. P., B.A.). THIRTEEN SERMONS, AN ESSAY, AND A FRAGMENT.** With a Prefatory Note by Rev. Prof. J. Estlin Carpenter, M.A. Crown 8vo, cloth. 4s. net.
- CAMPBELL (Rev. Canon COLIN).** **FIRST THREE GOSPELS IN GREEK.** *See* Testament, New, p. 26.
- CAMPBELL (Rev. R. J., City Temple, London).** **NEW THEOLOGY SERMONS.** Consisting of Twenty Sermons, most of which have not appeared elsewhere in print. Large Crown 8vo, cloth. 6s.
- CHANNING'S COMPLETE WORKS.** Including "The Perfect Life," with a Memoir. Centennial Edition. 4to Edition. Cloth. 7s. 6d.
- CHEYNE (Prof. T. K.). BIBLE PROBLEMS AND THE NEW MATERIAL FOR THEIR SOLUTION.** *See* Crown Theological Library, p. 11.
- CHILD AND RELIGION.** Edited by Thomas Stephens, B.A. *See* Crown Theological Library, p. 11.
- CHRISTIAN CREED (OUR).** 2nd and greatly Revised Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth. 3s. 6d.

## ALPHABETICAL LIST—Continued.

- CLARK (ARCHD. JAS.). DE SUCCESSIONE APOSTOLICA NEC NON MISSIONE ET JURISDICTIONE HIERARCHIAE ANGLICANÆ ET CATHOLICÆ.** 8vo. (*Georgetown, Guiana.*) Cloth. 21s.
- **SEVEN AGES OF THE CHURCH;** or, **Exposition of the Apocalypse.** Sewed. 1s.
- COIT (STANTON, Ph.D.). NATIONAL IDEALISM AND A STATE CHURCH.** Demy 8vo. 400 pages. 7s. 6d. net.
- COMMON PRAYER FOR CHRISTIAN WORSHIP:** in Ten Services for Morning and Evening. 32mo, cloth. 1s. 6d. Also in 8vo, cloth. 3s.
- CONWAY (MONCURE D.). CENTENARY HISTORY OF THE SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY.** With numerous Portraits, a facsimile of the original MS. of the hymn, "Nearer, my God, to Thee," and Appendices. Crown 8vo, half-vellum, paper sides. 5s.
- CORNILL (Prof. CARL). INTRODUCTION TO THE CANONICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.** Demy 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d. net. *See* Theological Translation Library, New Series, p. 3.
- DAVIDS (T. W. RHYS). LECTURES ON SOME POINTS IN THE HISTORY OF INDIAN BUDDHISM.** *See* The Hibbert Lectures, p. 14.
- DELITZSCH (F.). BABEL AND BIBLE.** Two Lectures delivered before the Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft in the presence of the German Emperor. *See* Crown Theological Library, p. 10. *See also* Harnack, A., "Letter to Preuss. Jahrbücher," p. 18.
- DOBSCHÜTZ (E. VON). CHRISTIAN LIFE IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.** *See* Theological Translation Library, New Series, p. 4.
- DRIVER (S. R.).** *See* Mosheh ben Shesheth, p. 22.
- DRUMMOND (JAMES, M.A., LL.D., Hon. Litt.D., late Principal of Manchester College, Oxford).** **AN INQUIRY INTO THE CHARACTER AND AUTHORSHIP OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.** Demy 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d.
- "The book is not only learned, but also reverent and spiritual in tone, and ought to find its way into the libraries of students of all shades of belief, as a very notable attempt to solve one of the most important of New Testament problems."—*Christian World.*
- **VIA, VERITAS, VITA.** *See* The Hibbert Lectures, p. 14.
- **PHILO JUDÆUS.** *See* p. 29.

## ALPHABETICAL LIST—Continued.

- ECHOES OF HOLY THOUGHTS:** Arranged as Private Meditations before a First Communion. 2nd Edition, with a Preface by Rev. J. Hamilton Thom. Printed with red lines. Fcap 8vo, cloth. 1s.
- EWALD (H.). COMMENTARY ON THE PROPHETS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.** See Theological Translation Library, Old Series, p. 8.
- **COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS.** See Theological Translation Library, Old Series, p. 8.
- EWALD (H.). COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF JOB.** See Theological Translation Library, Old Series, p. 8.
- FARNELL (L. R., D.Litt.). THE EVOLUTION OF RELIGION:** An Anthropological Study. See Crown Theological Library, p. 12.
- FORMBY (Rev. C. W., M.A.). RE-CREATION: A New Aspect of Evolution.** Crown 8vo, cloth 5s.
- FOUR GOSPELS (THE) AS HISTORICAL RECORDS.** 8vo, cloth. 15s.
- GILL (C.). THE EVOLUTION OF CHRISTIANITY.** By Charles Gill. 2nd Edition. With Dissertations in answer to Criticism. 8vo, cloth. 12s.
- **THE BOOK OF ENOCH THE PROPHET.** Translated from an Ethiopic MS. in the Bodleian Library, by the late Richard Laurence, LL.D., Archbishop of Cashel. The Text corrected from his latest Notes by Charles Gill. Re-issue. 8vo, cloth. 5s.
- HARNACK (ADOLF). MONASTICISM: Its Ideals and History; and THE CONFESSIONS OF ST. AUGUSTINE.** Two Lectures by Adolf Harnack. Translated into English by E. E. Kellett, M.A., and F. H. Marseille, Ph.D., M.A. Crown 8vo, cloth. 4s.
- “The lectures impart to these old subjects a new and vivid interest which cannot but win this faithful version many admiring readers.”—*Scotsman*.
- “One might read all the ponderous volumes of Montalembert without obtaining so clear a view or so rare a judgment of this immense subject as are offered in these luminous pages. . . . The translation is excellent, and gives us Harnack in pure and vigorous English.”—*Christian World*.
- **LETTER to the “Preussische Jahrbücher” on the German Emperor's Criticism of Prof. Delitzsch's Lectures on “Babel and Bible.”** Translated into English by Thomas Bailey Saunders. 6d. net.
- **LUKE, THE PHYSICIAN.** See Crown Theological Library.
- **HISTORY OF DOGMA.** See Theological Translation Library, New Series, p. 5.

## ALPHABETICAL LIST—Continued.

**HARNACK (ADOLF). THE SAYINGS OF JESUS.**  
See Crown Theological Library, p. 13.

— **WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY?** See Theological Translation Library, New Series, p. 6. Also Crown Theological Library, p. 11. See Saunders (T. B.), "Professor Harnack and his Oxford Critics," p. 25.

— **EXPANSION OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.** See Theological Translation Library, p. 4.

— and **HERRMANN (Dr. WILHELM). ESSAYS ON THE SOCIAL GOSPEL.** Translation edited by Maurice A. Canney, M.A. See Crown Theological Library, p. 13.

**HATCH (Rev. Dr.). LECTURES ON THE INFLUENCE OF GREEK IDEAS AND USAGES UPON THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.** See The Hibbert Lectures, p. 14.

**HAUSRATH (Prof. A.). HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT TIMES.** The Time of the Apostles. Translated by Leonard Huxley. With a Preface by Mrs Humphry Ward. 4 vols. 8vo, cloth. 42s. (Uniform with the Theological Translation Library, Old Series.)

— **NEW TESTAMENT TIMES.** The Times of Jesus. See Theological Translation Library, Old Series, p. 8.

**HEBREW TEXTS, in large type for Classes:**

Genesis. 2nd Edition. 16mo, cloth. 1s. 6d.

Psalms. 16mo, cloth. 1s.

Isaiah. 16mo, cloth. 1s.

Job. 16mo, cloth. 1s.

**HENSLOW (Rev. G.). THE ARGUMENT OF ADAPTATION; or, Natural Theology reconsidered.** 8vo, cloth. 1s.

— **SPIRITUAL TEACHINGS OF BIBLE PLANTS;** or, The Garden of God. 8vo, cloth. 1s.

— **THE AT-ONE-MENT; or, The Gospel of Reconciliation.** 8vo, cloth. 1s.

— **THE SPIRITUAL TEACHING OF CHRIST'S LIFE.** 8vo, cloth. 5s. net.

— **CHRIST NO PRODUCT OF EVOLUTION.** 8vo, cloth. 1s.

**HERFORD (R. TRAVERS, B.A.). CHRISTIANITY IN TALMUD AND MIDRASH.** Demy 8vo, cloth. 18s. net.

## ALPHABETICAL LIST—Continued.

- ECHOES OF HOLY THOUGHTS:** Arranged as Private Meditations before a First Communion. 2nd Edition, with a Preface by Rev. J. Hamilton Thom. Printed with red lines. Fcap. 8vo, cloth. 1s.
- EWALD (H.). COMMENTARY ON THE PROPHETS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.** See Theological Translation Library, Old Series, p. 8.
- **COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS.** See Theological Translation Library, Old Series, p. 8.
- EWALD (H.). COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF JOB.** See Theological Translation Library, Old Series, p. 8.
- FARNELL (L. R., D.Litt.). THE EVOLUTION OF RELIGION:** An Anthropological Study. See Crown Theological Library, p. 12.
- FORMBY (Rev. C. W., M.A.). RE-CREATION: A New Aspect of Evolution.** Crown 8vo, cloth 5s.
- FOUR GOSPELS (THE) AS HISTORICAL RECORDS.** 8vo, cloth. 15s.
- GILL (C.). THE EVOLUTION OF CHRISTIANITY.** By Charles Gill. 2nd Edition. With Dissertations in answer to Criticism. 8vo, cloth. 12s.
- **THE BOOK OF ENOCH THE PROPHET.** Translated from an Ethiopic MS. in the Bodleian Library, by the late Richard Laurence, LL.D., Archbishop of Cashel. The Text corrected from his latest Notes by Charles Gill. Re-issue. 8vo, cloth. 5s.
- HARNACK (ADOLF). MONASTICISM: Its Ideals and History; and THE CONFESSIONS OF ST. AUGUSTINE.** Two Lectures by Adolf Harnack. Translated into English by E. E. Kellett, M.A., and F. H. Marseille, Ph.D., M.A. Crown 8vo, cloth. 4s.
- “The lectures impart to these old subjects a new and vivid interest which cannot but win this faithful version many admiring readers.”—*Scotsman*.
- “One might read all the ponderous volumes of Montalembert without obtaining so clear a view or so rare a judgment of this immense subject as are offered in these luminous pages. . . . The translation is excellent, and gives us Harnack in pure and vigorous English.”—*Christian World*.
- **LETTER to the “Preussische Jahrbücher” on the German Emperor's Criticism of Prof. Delitzsch's Lectures on “Babel and Bible.”** Translated into English by Thomas Bailey Saunders. 6d. net.
- **LUKE, THE PHYSICIAN.** See Crown Theological Library.
- **HISTORY OF DOGMA.** See Theological Translation Library, New Series, p. 5.

## ALPHABETICAL LIST—Continued.

**HARNACK (ADOLF). THE SAYINGS OF JESUS.***See* Crown Theological Library, p. 13.**— WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY?** *See* Theological Translation Library, New Series, p. 6. *Also* Crown Theological Library, p. 11. *See* Saunders (T. B.), "Professor Harnack and his Oxford Critics," p. 25.**— EXPANSION OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.** *See* Theological Translation Library, p. 4.**— and HERRMANN (Dr. WILHELM). ESSAYS ON THE SOCIAL GOSPEL.** Translation edited by Maurice A. Canney, M.A. *See* Crown Theological Library, p. 13.**HATCH (Rev. Dr.). LECTURES ON THE INFLUENCE OF GREEK IDEAS AND USAGES UPON THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.** *See* The Hibbert Lectures, p. 14.**HAUSRATH (Prof. A.). HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT TIMES.** The Time of the Apostles. Translated by Leonard Huxley. With a Preface by Mrs Humphry Ward. 4 vols. 8vo, cloth. 42s. (Uniform with the Theological Translation Library, Old Series.)**— NEW TESTAMENT TIMES.** The Times of Jesus. *See* Theological Translation Library, Old Series, p. 8.**HEBREW TEXTS, in large type for Classes:**

Genesis. 2nd Edition. 16mo, cloth. 1s. 6d.

Psalms. 16mo, cloth. 1s.

Isaiah. 16mo, cloth. 1s.

Job. 16mo, cloth. 1s.

**HENSLOW (Rev. G.). THE ARGUMENT OF ADAPTATION; or, Natural Theology reconsidered.** 8vo, cloth. 1s.**— SPIRITUAL TEACHINGS OF BIBLE PLANTS; or, The Garden of God.** 8vo, cloth. 1s.**— THE AT-ONE-MENT; or, The Gospel of Reconciliation.** 8vo, cloth. 1s.**— THE SPIRITUAL TEACHING OF CHRIST'S LIFE.** 8vo, cloth. 5s. net.**— CHRIST NO PRODUCT OF EVOLUTION.** 8vo, cloth. 1s.**HERFORD (R. TRAVERS, B.A.). CHRISTIANITY IN TALMUD AND MIDRASH.** Demy 8vo, cloth. 18s. net.

---

ALPHABETICAL LIST—Continued.

**CONTENTS** :—Introduction. Division I. Passages from the Rabbinical Literature: A. Passages relating to Jesus. B. Passages relating to Minim, Minuth. Division II. General Results. Appendix containing the Original Texts of the Passages translated. Indices.

“ His book (if he is right in his identification of the Minim) is a history of Judaising Christianity—the first independent and competent history written in English.”—*Expository Times*.

“ It must become at once the standard authority on its subject.”—*Manchester Guardian*.

“ It is no exaggeration to say that it will prove indispensable not only to scholars interested in Talmudic literature, but to all who study the subject of the evangelical tradition. It will introduce the reader into a new world—that of Jewish thought in the centuries after Christ”—*Cambridge Review*.

**HERRMANN (W.). THE COMMUNION OF THE CHRISTIAN WITH GOD.** See Theological Translation Library, New Series, p. 6.

— **FAITH AND MORALS.** See Crown Theological Library, p. 11.

— and **HARNACK (ADOLF.). ESSAYS ON THE SOCIAL GOSPEL.** See Crown Theological Library, p. 13.

**HIBBERT JOURNAL: A Quarterly Review of Religion, Theology, and Philosophy.** Edited by L. P. Jacks and G. Dawes Hicks. Vol. I. Royal 8vo. 856 pp. Vol. II. 864 pp. Vol. III. 869 pp. Vols. IV. and V., 960 pp. Cloth. Each 12s. 6d. net. Annual Subscription, 10s. post free.

**HOERNING (Dr. R.). THE KARAITE MSS., BRITISH MUSEUM.** The Karaite Exodus (i. to viii. 5) in Forty-two Autotype Facsimiles, with a Transcription in ordinary Arabic type. Together with Descriptions and Collation of that and five other MSS. of portions of the Hebrew Bible in Arabic characters in the same Collection. Royal 4to, cloth, gilt top. 20s.

**HUNTER (Rev. J., D.D.). THE COMING CHURCH. A Plea for a Church simply Christian.** Cloth. 1s. 6d. net.

**JOHNSON (EDWIN, M.A.). THE RISE OF CHRISTENDOM.** Demy 8vo, cloth. 7s. 6d.

— **ANTIQUA MATER: A Study of Christian Origins.** Crown 8vo, cloth. 2s. 6d.

— **THE RISE OF ENGLISH CULTURE.** Demy 8vo, cloth. 15s. net.

**JONES (Rev. R. CROMPTON). HYMNS OF DUTY AND FAITH.** Selected and Arranged. 247 pp. Fcap. 8vo, cloth. 2nd Edition. 3s. 6d.

---

## ALPHABETICAL LIST—Continued.

**JONES (Rev. R. CROMPTON).** CHANTS, PSALMS, AND CANTICLES. Selected and Pointed for Chanting. 18mo, cloth. 1s. 6d.

— ANTHEMS. With Indexes and References to the Music. 18mo, cloth. 1s. 3d.

— THE CHANTS AND ANTHEMS. Together in 1 vol., cloth. 2s.

— A BOOK OF PRAYER. In Thirty Orders of Worship, with Additional Prayers and Thanksgivings. 18mo, cloth. 2s. 6d. With Chants, in 1 vol. 18mo, cloth. 3s.

**KAUTZSCH (E.).** AN OUTLINE OF THE HISTORY OF THE LITERATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. With Chronological Tables for the History of the Israelites, and other Aids to the Explanation of the Old Testament. Reprinted from the "Supplement to the Translation of the Old Testament." By E. Kautzsch, Professor of Theology at the University of Halle. Edited by the Author. Translated by John Taylor, D.Lit., M.A., etc. Demy 8vo, cloth. 6s. 6d.

"This English translation . . . is likely to prove very acceptable to all those students who desire to see for themselves the view taken by the 'higher critics' of the growth of the Old Testament."—*The Guardian*.

"Dr. Taylor has rendered a great service to the English readers by his excellent translation of this important work."—*British Weekly*

**KEIM'S HISTORY OF JESUS OF NAZARA.** See Theological Translation Library, Old Series, p. 8.

**KENNEDY (Rev. JAS.).** BIBLICAL HEBREW. See p. 35.

**KITTEL (R.).** HISTORY OF THE HEBREWS. See Theological Translation Library, New Series, p. 6.

**KUENEN (Dr. A.).** LECTURES ON NATIONAL AND UNIVERSAL RELIGIONS. See The Hibbert Lectures, p. 14.

— THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL TO THE FALL OF THE JEWISH STATE. See Theological Translation Library, Old Series, p. 9.

**LAKE (Professor KIRSOPP).** THE HISTORICAL EVIDENCE FOR THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST. See Crown Theological Library, p. 13.

**LEA (HENRY CHARLES, LL.D.).** HISTORY OF SACERDOTAL CELIBACY IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. Third Edition. Thoroughly Revised and Reset. 2 vols. Medium 8vo, cloth. 21s. net.

## ALPHABETICAL LIST—Continued.

- LOBSTEIN (P.). THE DOGMA OF THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF CHRIST.** *See* Crown Theological Library, p. 10.
- LODGE (Sir O.). LIFE AND MATTER: A Criticism of Professor Haeckel's "Riddle of the Universe." Fourth impression. Crown 8vo, cloth. 2s. 6d. net.**
- MACAN (R. W.). THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST.** An Essay in Three Chapters. 8vo, cloth. 5s.
- MACKAY (R. W.). SKETCH OF THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY.** 8vo, cloth. 6s.
- MARCHANT (JAMES). THEORIES OF THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST.** Crown 8vo, stiff covers, 2s. net; superior cloth binding, 3s.
- MARTI (KARL). RELIGION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.** *See* Crown Theological Library, p. 13.
- MARTINEAU (Rev. Dr. JAMES). THE RELATION BETWEEN ETHICS AND RELIGION.** An Address. 8vo, sewed. 1s.
- **MODERN MATERIALISM: Its Attitude towards Theology.** A Critique and Defence. 8vo, sewed. 2s. 6d.
- MERCER (Rt. Rev. J. EDWARD, D.D.). THE SOUL OF PROGRESS.** Being the First Series of Lectures to be known as The Moorhouse Lectures. Crown 8vo, cloth. 6s.
- MITCHELL (Rev. A. F.). HOW TO TEACH THE BIBLE.** 2nd Edition, thoroughly revised and reset. Crown 8vo, cloth. 2s. 6d.
- Sir Oliver Lodge quotes the book in an article in *Contemporary Review*, and states that the book contains many useful hints and much information.
- "The lectures are marked by much insight and moderation. The book is notable also for its gracious and cultured note, and for the quiet persuasiveness with which a revolutionary reform is advocated"—*Sunday School Chronicle*.
- MONTEFIORE (C. G.). ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF RELIGION AS ILLUSTRATED BY THE RELIGION OF THE ANCIENT HEBREWS.** *See* The Hibbert Lectures, p. 14.
- MOSHEH BEN SHESHETH'S COMMENTARY ON JEREMIAH AND EZEKIEL.** Edited from a Bodleian MS., with a Translation and Notes, by S. R. Driver. 8vo, sewed. 3s.
- MÜNSTERBERG (Prof. HUGO). THE AMERICANS.** *See* p. 30.

## ALPHABETICAL LIST—Continued.

- NESTLE (E.). INTRODUCTION TO THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT.** *See* Theological Translation Library, New Series, p. 7.
- OTTO (R.). NATURALISM AND RELIGION.** *See* Crown Theological Library, p. 12.
- PERRIN (R. S.). THE EVOLUTION OF KNOWLEDGE: A Review of Philosophy.** Crown 8vo, cloth. 6s.
- PERSONAL AND FAMILY PRAYERS.** 8vo, buckram. 1s. net.
- PETERS (JOHN P.). EARLY HEBREW STORY.** A Study of the Origin, the Value, and the Historical Background of the Legends of Israel. *See* Crown Theological Library, p. 11.
- PFLEIDERER (Dr. O.). LECTURES ON THE INFLUENCE OF THE APOSTLE PAUL ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIANITY.** *See* The Hibbert Lectures, p. 14.
- **PAULINISM: A Contribution to the History of Primitive Christianity.** *See* Theological Translation Library, Old Series, p. 9.
- **PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION ON THE BASIS OF ITS HISTORY.** *See* Theological Translation Library, Old Series, p. 9.
- **THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CONCEPTION OF CHRIST:** Its Significance and Value in the History of Religion. *See* Crown Theological Library, p. 11.
- **PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.** Vol. I. Demy 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d. net. *See* Theological Translation Library, New Series, p. 3.
- POOLE (REG. LANE). ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE HISTORY OF MEDIAEVAL THOUGHT IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF THEOLOGY AND ECCLESIASTICAL POLITICS.** 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d.
- PROTESTANT COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.** *See* Theological Translation Library, Old Series, p. 9.
- RENAN (E.). ON THE INFLUENCE OF THE INSTITUTIONS, THOUGHT, AND CULTURE OF ROME ON CHRISTIANITY AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.** *See* Hibbert Lectures, p. 14.

## ALPHABETICAL LIST—Continued.

**RENOUF (P. LE PAGE).** **ON THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT EGYPT.** *See* Hibbert Lectures, p. 15.

**RÉVILLE (A.).** **THE SONG OF SONGS,** commonly called the Song of Solomon, or the Canticle. Translated from the French. Crown 8vo, cloth. 1s. 6d.

**RÉVILLE (A.).** **ON NATIVE RELIGIONS OF MEXICO AND PERU.** *See* Hibbert Lectures, p. 15.

— **PROLEGOMENA OF THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS.** *See* Theological Translation Library, Old Series, p. 9.

**RÉVILLE (JEAN).** **LIBERAL CHRISTIANITY.** *See* Crown Theological Library, p. 10.

— *See also* Sabatier's "Religions of Authority and Religion of the Spirit," p. 4.

**RIX (HERBERT).** **TENT AND TESTAMENT.** A Camping Tour in Palestine, with some Notes on Scripture Sites. With 61 Illustrations, Frontispiece, and Maps. Demy 8vo, cloth. 8s. 6d. net.

"His narrative of travel is that of an intelligent and well-informed traveller who went without prepossessions and was both able and willing to weigh evidence. . . . Mr Rix's contribution is one that must be taken into account."—*Spectator.*

"The result is a thoughtful, well-written, even learned work, far from the vain outpourings of the tourist. The narrative, though heavily charged with information, is wonderfully unembarrassed, and the word-pictures which abound are true to life."—*Athenaeum.*

**RIX.** **SERMONS, ESSAYS, AND ADDRESSES.** With Introduction by Rev. P. H. Wicksteed, M.A. Crown 8vo, cloth.

**ROBINSON (ALEX., M.A., B.D.).** **A STUDY OF THE SAVIOUR IN THE NEWER LIGHT.** 2nd Edition. Revised and partly re-written. Demy 8vo, cloth. 5s. net.

— **OLD AND NEW CERTAINTY OF THE GOSPEL.** A Sketch. Crown 8vo, cloth. 2s. 6d.

**SABATIER (AUGUSTE).** **THE RELIGIONS OF AUTHORITY AND THE RELIGION OF THE SPIRIT.** With a Memoir by Professor J. Réville. *See* Theological Translation Library, New Series, p. 4.

— **THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT AND ITS HISTORICAL EVOLUTION;** and **RELIGION AND MODERN CULTURE.** *See* Crown Theological Library, p. 11.

**SADLER (Rev. Dr.).** **PRAYERS FOR CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.** Crown 8vo, cloth. 3s. 6d.

## ALPHABETICAL LIST—Continued.

**SADLER** (Rev. Dr.). **CLOSET PRAYERS**, Original and Compiled. 18mo, cloth. 1s. 6d.

**SAUNDERS** (T. BAILEY). **PROFESSOR HARNACK AND HIS OXFORD CRITICS**. Crown 8vo, cloth. 1s. 6d. net.

"It gives thoughtful and acutely reasoned support to the great historical student of Christianity who represents Berlin in theology against the pig-tailed opposition which Oxford has offered to his learning. A spirited piece of controversial writing, it cannot but prove stimulating to readers interested in modern divinity, no matter to which side of the debate their private pre-possessions incline them."—*Scotsman*.

"Mr. Saunders writes with sobriety and with a knowledge of the points at issue. Readers of 'Harnack and his Critics' will do well to read his comments."—*Sheffield Daily Telegraph*.

**SAVAGE** (M. J.). **BELIEFS ABOUT THE BIBLE**. 8vo, cloth. 7s. 6d.

**SAYCE** (A. H.). **ON THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT ASSYRIA AND BABYLONIA**. *See* Hibbert Lectures, p. 15.

**SCHRADER** (E.). **CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS AND THE OLD TESTAMENT**. *See* Theological Translation Library, Old Series, p. 9.

**SCHUBERT** (HANS VON). **CHURCH HISTORY**. *See* Theological Translation Library, New Series, p. 3.

**SCOTT** (Rev. E. F., M.A.). **THE APOLOGETIC OF THE NEW TESTAMENT**. *See* Crown Theological Library, p. 13.

**SCULLARD** (Rev. H. H., M.A., D.D.). **EARLY CHRISTIAN ETHICS IN THE WEST**, from Clement to Ambrose. Crown 8vo, cloth. 6s.

**SEVERUS** (Patriarch of Antioch). **THE SIXTH BOOK OF THE SELECT LETTERS OF SEVERUS, PATRIARCH OF ANTIOCH**, in the Syriac Version of Athanasius of Nisibis. Edited and translated by E. W. Brooks. Vol. I. (Text), Part 1, and Vol. II. (Translation), Part 1. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. 42s. net. Vol. I. (Text), Part 2, and Vol. II. (Translation), Part 2. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. 42s. net. *See* Text and Translation Society, p. 38.

**SHARPE** (SAMUEL). **HISTORY OF THE HEBREW NATION AND ITS LITERATURE**. With an Appendix on the Hebrew Chronology. 5th Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth. 4s. 6d.

— **CRITICAL NOTES ON THE AUTHORISED ENGLISH VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT**. 2nd Edition. 12mo, cloth. 1s. 6d.

## ALPHABETICAL LIST—Continued.

**SMITH (MARTIN R.). WHAT I HAVE TAUGHT MY CHILDREN.** 2nd Edition, Revised. Crown 8vo, cloth. 3s. 6d.

**SODEN (H. von, D.D.). THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.** See Crown Theological Library, p. 12.

**THE STATUTES OF THE APOSTLES.** The hitherto unedited Ethiopic and Arabic Texts. Edited, with an Introduction and Translations of the Ethiopic, Arabic, and Coptic Texts, by Rev. G. Horner, M.A. With an Appendix—a recently discovered variant of the Coptic Text. 18s. net.

**TAYLER (Rev. JOHN JAMES). AN ATTEMPT TO ASCERTAIN THE CHARACTER OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL, especially in its Relation to the First Three.** 2nd Edition. 8vo, cloth. 5s.

**TAYLOR (Rev. C.). THE DIRGE OF COHELETH IN ECCLES. XII. DISCUSSED AND LITERALLY INTERPRETED.** 8vo, cloth. 3s.

**TAYLOR (Rev. Dr J.). THE MASSORETIC TEXT AND THE ANCIENT VERSIONS OF THE BOOK OF MICAH.** Crown 8vo, cloth. 5s.

— *See also* Kautzsch, "Outline," p. 21.

**TEN SERVICES OF PUBLIC PRAYER**, taken in Substance from the Common Prayer for Christian Worship, with a few Additional Prayers for Particular Days. 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d.; or 32mo, cloth, 1s.

— **SERVICES OF PUBLIC PRAYER**, with Special Collects. 8vo, cloth, 3s.; or 32mo, cloth, 1s. 6d.

— **PSALMS AND CANTICLES.** 8vo, cloth. 1s. 6d.

— **PSALMS AND CANTICLES**, with Anthems. 8vo, cloth. 2s.

**TESTAMENT, THE NEW.** TISCHENDORF (C.). **NOVUM TESTAMENTUM GRÆCE.** 3 vols. 8vo. 70s. net.

— **CAMPBELL (Rev. Canon COLIN, M.A., D.D.). THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS IN GREEK.** Arranged in parallel columns. 2nd Edition, Revised. Crown 8vo, cloth. 3s. 6d. net.

**THOMAS (Rev. J. M. LLOYD).** **A FREE CATHOLIC CHURCH.** Crown 8vo, cloth. 1s. 6d. net.

## ALPHABETICAL LIST—Continued.

**UPTON (C. B.). ON THE BASES OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF.** *See* Hibbert Lectures, p. 15.

**VICKERS (J.). THE REAL JESUS: A Review of His Life, Character, and Death, from a Jewish Stand-point.** Crown 8vo. 6s.

— **THE CRUCIFIXION MYSTERY.** Crown 8vo, cloth. 3s. 6d.

**VOYSEY (Rev. C.). THE SLING AND THE STONE.** Vol. VIII. On the Lord's Prayer. 8vo, cloth. 3s. 6d. Vol. IX. The Fatherhood of God. Sermon on the Mount, etc. 8vo, cloth. 7s. 6d. Vol. X Revelation tested on Moral Grounds, etc. 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d.

— **THEISM AS A SCIENCE OF NATURAL THEOLOGY AND NATURAL RELIGION.** 2s. 6d.

— **THEISTIC PRAYER BOOK.** 3rd Edition. 12mo, cloth. 3s. 6d.

**WEIR (T. H., B.D.). A SHORT HISTORY OF THE HEBREW TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.** By Thomas H. Weir, Assistant to the Professor of Oriental Languages in the University of Glasgow. 2nd Edition, with Additions. Crown 8vo, cloth. 6s.

**WEIZSACKER (C. VON). THE APOSTOLIC AGE.** 2 vols. *See* Theological Translation Library, New Series, p. 7.

**WERNLE (PAUL). THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY.** 2 vols. 8vo. *See* Theological Translation Library, New Series, p. 5.

**WICKSTEED (Rev. P. H.). THE ECCLESIASTICAL INSTITUTIONS OF HOLLAND,** treated with Special Reference to the Position and Prospects of the Modern School of Theology. A Report presented to the Hibbert Trustees, and published by their direction. 8vo, sewed. 1s.

**WIMMER (R.). MY STRUGGLE FOR LIGHT: Confessions of a Preacher.** *See* Crown Theological Library, p. 10.

**ALPHABETICAL LIST—Continued.**

**WRIGHT (Rev. C. H. H.). BOOK OF GENESIS IN HEBREW TEXT.** With a critically revised Text, various Readings, and Grammatical and Critical Notes. Demy 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— **BOOK OF RUTH IN HEBREW TEXT.** With a critically revised Text, various Readings, including a new Collation of Twenty-eight Hebrew MSS., and a Grammatical and Critical Commentary ; to which is appended the Chaldee Targum. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.

— **DANIEL AND HIS PROPHECIES.** Demy 8vo, cloth. 7s. 6d.

— **DANIEL AND ITS CRITICS : A Critical and Grammatical Commentary, with Appendix.** Demy 8vo, cloth. 7s. 6d.

**WRIGHT (G. H. BATESON). THE BOOK OF JOB.** A new critically revised Translation, with Essays on Scansion, Date, etc. 8vo, cloth. 6s.

— **WAS ISRAEL EVER IN EGYPT? or, A Lost Tradition.** By G H. Bateson Wright, D.D., Queen's College, Oxford; Headmaster Queen's College, Hong-Kong; Author of "A Critical Revised Translation of the Book of Job." 8vo, art linen. 7s. 6d.

**WRIGHT (W. ALDIS), Edited by, and Dr. S. A. HIRSCH. A COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF JOB.** From a Hebrew MS. in the University Library, Cambridge. Med. 8vo, cloth. 21s. net.

**ZELLER (E.). CONTENTS AND ORIGIN OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.** See Theological Translation Library, Old Series, p. 9.



## II. Philosophy, Psychology.

- BACON (ROGER), THE "OPUS MAJUS" OF.** Edited, with Introduction and Analytical Table, by John Henry Bridges, Fellow of Royal College of Physicians, sometime Fellow of Oriel College. Complete in 3 vols., 3*1s. 6d.*; Vol. III. sold separately, *7s. 6d.*
- BREWSTER (H. B.). THE THEORIES OF ANARCHY AND OF LAW.** A Midnight Debate. Crown 8vo, parchment. *5s.*
- **THE PRISON.** A Dialogue. Crown 8vo, parchment. *5s.*
- **THE STATUETTE AND THE BACKGROUND.** Crown 8vo, parchment. *4s.*
- COLLINS (F. H.). AN EPITOME OF THE SYNTHETIC PHILOSOPHY.** By F. Howard Collins. With a Preface by Herbert Spencer. 5th Edition. The Synthetic Philosophy Completed. 8vo, cloth. *21s.*
- DRUMMOND (Dr.). PHILO JUDÆUS; or, The Jewish Alexandrian Philosophy in its Development and Completion.** By James Drummond, LL.D., Principal of Manchester New College, Oxford. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. *21s.*
- HODGSON (S. H.). PHILOSOPHY AND EXPERIENCE.** An Address delivered before the Aristotelian Society. 8vo, sewed. *2s.*
- **THE REORGANISATION OF PHILOSOPHY.** Address. 8vo, sewed. *1s.*
- LAURIE (Professor SIMON). ETHICA: or, The Ethics of Reason.** By Scotus Novanticus. 2nd Edition. 8vo, cloth. *6s.*
- **METAPHYSICA NOVA ET VETUSTA: A Return to Dualism.** 2nd Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth. *6s.*
- LODGE (Sir O.). LIFE AND MATTER.** See Religion, p. 22.
- MACKENZIE (MALCOLM). SOCIAL AND POLITICAL DYNAMICS.** An Exposition of the Function of Money as the measure of Contract, Trade, and Government, viewed from the Principles of Natural Philosophy and Jurisprudence, in refutation of Economic Dogmas. Demy 8vo, cloth. *10s. 6d.*

**MÜNSTERBERG (HUGO, Professor of Psychology at Harvard University).** **THE AMERICANS.** Translated by Edwin B. Holt, Ph.D., Instructor at Harvard University. Royal 8vo, cloth. 12s. 6d. net.

**PERRIN (R. S.).** **EVOLUTION OF KNOWLEDGE (THE): A Review of Philosophy.** See Religion, p. 23.

**PIKLER (JUL.).** **THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE BELIEF IN OBJECTIVE EXISTENCE.** Part I. 8vo, cloth. 4s. 6d.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE ARISTOTELIAN SOCIETY FOR THE SYSTEMATIC STUDY OF PHILOSOPHY.** **Proceedings.** Vol. I., 4 Nos., 1890-91. 8vo. 12s. Discontinued after Vol. III. Part 2. Or each Part separately. Vol. I. No. 1, 2s. 6d.; No. 2, 2s. 6d.; No. 3, Part 1, 1s. 6d.; Part 2, 2s.; No. 4, Part 1, 1s. 6d.; Part 2, 2s. Vol. II. No. 1, Part 1, 1s. 6d.; Part 2, 2s.; No. 2, Part 1, 1s. 6d.; Part 2, 2s.; No. 3, Part 1, 2s., Part 2, 2s. Vol. III. Part 1, 2s. 6d., Part 2, 2s. **NEW SERIES,** Vols. I.-VII. Demy 8vo, buckram, each 10s. 6d. net.

**SALEEBY (C. W., M.D., F.R.S.).** **INDIVIDUALISM AND COLLECTIVISM.** Crown 8vo, cloth. 2s.

**SCHURMAN (J. GOULD).** **KANTIAN ETHICS AND THE ETHICS OF EVOLUTION.** 8vo, cloth. 5s.

— **THE ETHICAL IMPORT OF DARWINISM.** Crown 8vo, cloth. 5s.

**SCRIPTURE (EDWARD W., Ph.D.).** **STUDIES FROM THE YALE PSYCHOLOGICAL LABORATORY.** Vols. I.-VI., each 4s. 2d. net.

**SHEARMAN (A. T., M.A.).** **THE DEVELOPMENT OF SYMBOLIC LOGIC. A Critical Historical Study of the Logical Calculus.** Crown 8vo, cloth. 5s. net.

*From the Contents.*

Symbols as representing Terms and as representing Propositions—Symbols of Operation—The Process of Solution—Concerning a Calculus Based on Intension—The Doctrines of Jevons and of Mr MacColl—Later Logical Doctrines—The Utility of Symbolic Logic.

"Its style is smooth, pleasant, and lucid."—*Athenaeum.*

**SMITH (H. W.).** **THE GARDEN OF LIFE.** Flowers of Thought on Culture, Conduct, and Character for every day in the year, gathered and arranged by H. W. Smith. Crown 8vo, cloth gilt. 5s. net.

**SPENCER (HERBERT). AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY.**  
2 vols. Demy 8vo. With Portraits. Green buckram, gilt top.  
28s. net.

"It is not too much to say that we close this book, the most interesting, and certainly one of the most important we have ever opened, feeling better, wiser, and humbler for having thus hastily read it."—*Academy*.

"It is a book for all men and for all time. In its pages the thinker may trace, step by step, the synthesis of synthetic philosophy. Here the poet will find not only a worthy inspiration, but a possibly surprising vein of sympathy. The statesman, the inventor, the litterateur, the man of theory, and the man of practice will find alike, within the covers of these two massive volumes, an almost inexhaustible treasury of interest and constructive thought. There is suggestion and instruction for all the world, and an almost indefinable fascination—whether it be due to the mere intrinsic beauty of the picture itself, or to the dignity of its execution, or to the sense of its almost laborious faithfulness, or to the combined attraction of all three."—*St James's Gazette*.

## — A SYSTEM OF SYNTHETIC PHILOSOPHY —

Vol. I. **FIRST PRINCIPLES.** With an Appendix and a Portrait. Finally revised. New Edition, large crown 8vo, cloth. 7s. 6d.

Vols. II. and III. **THE PRINCIPLES OF BIOLOGY.** 6th Thousand. 8vo, cloth. Revised and greatly enlarged. Vols. I. and II. 18s. each.

Vols. IV. and V. **THE PRINCIPLES OF PSYCHOLOGY.** 5th Thousand. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. 36s.

Vol. VI. **THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIOLOGY.** Vol. I. Part 1, The Data of Sociology; Part 2, The Inductions of Sociology; Part 3, Domestic Institutions. 4th Thousand, revised and enlarged. 8vo, cloth. 21s.

Vol. VII. **THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIOLOGY.** Vol. II. Part 4, Ceremonial Institutions; Part 5, Political Institutions. 3rd Thousand. 8vo, cloth. 18s.

Vol. VIII. **THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIOLOGY.** Vol. III. Part 6, Ecclesiastical Institutions; Part 7, Professional Institutions; Part 8, Industrial Institutions. 2nd Thousand. 8vo, cloth. 16s.

Vol. IX. **THE PRINCIPLES OF ETHICS.** Vol. I. Part 1, The Data of Ethics; Part 2, The Inductions of Ethics; Part 3, The Ethics of Individual Life. 2nd Thousand. 8vo, cloth. 15s.

Vol. X. **THE PRINCIPLES OF ETHICS.** Vol. II. Part 4, Justice; Part 5, Negative Beneficence; Part 6, Positive Beneficence; Appendices. Demy 8vo, cloth. 12s. 6d.

*Also to be had separately:*

**SPENCER (HERBERT).** **DATA OF ETHICS.** Reset uniform with popular edition of "First Principles." Sewed, 2s. 6d. net.; cloth, 3s. net.

— **JUSTICE.** Being Part 4 of the Principles of Ethics. 2nd Thousand. 8vo, cloth. 6s.

*Other Works.*

— **THE STUDY OF SOCIOLOGY.** Library Edition (21st thousand), with a Postscript. 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d.

— **DATA OF ETHICS.** Small Demy 8vo, cloth. 3s. net.; sewed, 2s. 6d. net.

— **EDUCATION: Intellectual, Moral, and Physical.** Cheap Edition. Entirely reset. 46th Thousand. Crown 8vo, cloth. 2s. 6d.

— **ESSAYS: Scientific, Political, and Speculative.** A new Edition, rearranged, with additional Essays. 3 vols. 8vo, cloth. (Each 10s.) 30s.

— **SOCIAL STATICS.** Abridged and revised, together with "The Man *v.* The State." 8vo, cloth. 10s.

— **VARIOUS FRAGMENTS.** Uniform in library binding. Demy 8vo, cloth. Enlarged Edition. 6s.

— **FACTS AND COMMENTS.** Demy 8vo, cloth. 6s.

— **THE MAN *versus* THE STATE.** 14th Thousand. Sewed. 1s.

— **A REJOINDER TO PROFESSOR WEISMANN.** Sewed. 6d.

— **REASONS FOR DISSENTING FROM THE PHILOSOPHY OF M. COMTE.** Sewed. 6d.

— **DESCRIPTIVE SOCIOLOGY; or, Groups of Sociological Facts.** Compiled and abstracted by Professor D. Duncan of Madras, Dr Richard Scheppig, and James Collier. Folio, boards.

No. 1. English. 18s.

No. 2. Ancient American Races. 16s.

No. 3. Lowest Races, Negrito Races, Polynesians. 18s.

No. 4. African Races. 16s.

No. 5. Asiatic Races. 18s.

No. 6. American Races. 18s.

No. 7. Hebrews and Phœnicians. 21s.

No. 8. The French Civilisation. 30s.

*New volumes in preparation.*

**SPENCER (HERBERT). COLLINS (F. H.). AN EPITOME OF THE SYNTHETIC PHILOSOPHY.**  
By F. Howard Collins. Being a Digest of Mr Herbert Spencer's Works. 5th Edition, the Synthetic Philosophy Completed. With a Preface by Herbert Spencer. 8vo, cloth.  
21s.

— **DREY (S.). HERBERT SPENCER'S THEORY OF RELIGION AND MORALITY.** By Sylvan Drey. 8vo, sewed. 1s.

— — **A THEORY OF LIFE DEDUCED FROM THE EVOLUTION PHILOSOPHY.** Demy 8vo, sewed. 1s.

**SPINOZA: Four Essays.** By Professors Land, Van Vloten, and Kuno Fischer, and by E. Renan. Edited by Professor Knight, of St Andrews. Crown 8vo, cloth. 5s.

**STUDIES FROM THE YALE PSYCHOLOGICAL LABORATORY.** Edited by Professor E. W. Scripture. With many Illustrations. 8vo, sewed. 4s. 2d. each net. Vol. I. 1892-93, 100 pages. Vol. II. 1894, 124 pages. Vol. III. 1895, 110 pages. Vol. IV. 1896, 141 pages. Vol. V. 1897, 105 pages. Vol. VI. 1898, 105 pages.

**WUNDT (WILHELM). OUTLINES OF PSYCHOLOGY.** Translated, with the co-operation of the Author, by Charles Hubbard Judd, Ph.D., Instructor in the Wesleyan University. 3rd Enlarged Edition. Demy 8vo, cloth. 8s. net.

### III. Oriental Languages, Literature, and History.

**ABHIDHANARATNAMALA (THE) OF HALAYUDHA.** A Sanskrit Vocabulary (120 pp.). Edited, with a Sanskrit-English Glossary (180 pp.), by Dr. T. Aufrecht. 8vo, cloth. (Published at 18s.) 10s.

**AVESTI, PAHLAVI, and ANCIENT PERSIAN STUDIES** in Honour of the late SHAMS-UL-ULAMA DASTUR PESHOTANJI BEHRAMJI SANJANA, M.A., Ph.D. Paper cover, 12s. 6d. net.; cloth, 13s. 6d. net.

**BERNSTEIN and KIRSCH. SYRIAC CHRESTOMATHY AND LEXICON** (*Chrestomathia Syriaca cum Lexico*). 2 vols in 1. 8vo, cloth boards. 7s. 6d. I. *Chrestomathia*, separately. Sewed. 3s.

**DAVIDS (T. W. RHYS).** *LECTURES ON SOME POINTS IN THE HISTORY OF INDIAN BUDDHISM.* See *The Hibbert Lectures*, p. 14.

**DELITZSCH (Prof. F.). ASSYRIAN GRAMMAR.** With Paradigms, Exercises, Glossary, and Bibliography. Translated by the Rev. Prof. A. R. S. Kennedy. Crown 8vo, cloth. 15s.

— **THE HEBREW LANGUAGE VIEWED IN THE LIGHT OF ASSYRIAN RESEARCH.** Demy 8vo, cloth. 4s.

— **BABEL AND BIBLE.** See *Crown Theological Library*, p. 10.

**DILLMANN (A.). ETHIOPIAN GRAMMAR.** Translated from C. Bezold's Second German Edition. By Rev. J. A. Crichton, D.D., with Index of Passages, Philological Tables, etc. 1 vol., Royal 8vo. 25s. net.

**DIPAVAMSA (THE): A Buddhist Historical Record in the Pali Language.** Edited, with an English Translation, by Dr. H. Oldenberg. 8vo, cloth. 21s.

The "Dipavamsa" is the most ancient historical work of the Ceylonese ; it contains an account of the ecclesiastical history of the Buddhist Church, of the conversion of the Ceylonese to the Buddhist faith, and of the ancient history of Ceylon.

**ERMAN'S EGYPTIAN GRAMMAR.** Translated, under Professor Erman's supervision, by J. H. Breasted, Professor of Egyptology in the University of Chicago. Crown 8vo, cloth. 18s.

**EVANS (GEORGE).** AN ESSAY ON ASSYRIOLOGY.  
With 4to Tables of Assyrian Inscriptions. 8vo, cloth. 5s.

**FAIZULLAH-BHAI (Shaikh, B.D.). A MOSLEM PRESENT.** Part I., containing the famous poem of Al-Busaree. With an English Version and Notes. 8vo, cloth. 4s.

— AN ESSAY ON THE PRE-ISLAMITIC ARABIC POETRY, with special reference to the Seven Suspended Poems. 8vo, sewed. 4d.

**FLINDERS PETRIE PAPYRI.** *See* Cunningham Memoirs, vols. 8, 9, and 11, p. 46.

**FRANKFURTER (Dr. O.). HANDBOOK OF PALI:** Being an Elementary Grammar, a Chrestomathy, and a Glossary. 8vo, cloth. 16s.

**FUERST (Dr. JUL.). HEBREW AND CHALDEE LEXICON TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.** 5th Edition, improved and enlarged. Translated by Rev. Dr. Samuel Davidson. Royal 8vo, cloth. 21s.

**HARDY (R. SPENCE).** MANUAL OF BUDDHISM IN ITS MODERN DEVELOPMENT. Translated from Singhalese MSS. 2nd Edition, with a complete Index and Glossary. 8vo, cloth. 21s.

**HEBREW TEXTS.** Large type. 16mo, cloth.

Genesis. (2nd Edition. Baer and Delitzsch's Text.) 1s. 6d.

Psalms. 1s.

Job. 1s.

Isaiah. 1s.

**KENNEDY (Rev. JAS.). INTRODUCTION TO BIBLICAL HEBREW,** presenting Graduated Instruction in the Language of the Old Testament. By James Kennedy, B.D., Acting Librarian in the New College, and one of the additional Examiners in Divinity at the University, Edinburgh. 8vo, cloth. 12s.

— STUDIES IN HEBREW SYNONYMS. Demy 8vo. cloth. 5s.

**LYALL (C. J., M.A., K.C.I.E.). ANCIENT ARABIAN POETRY, CHIEFLY PRÆ-ISLAMIC.** Translations, with an Introduction and Notes. Fcap. 4to, cloth. 10s. 6d.

**MACHBEROTH ITHIEL.** By Yehuda ben Shelomoh Alcharizi. Edited from the MS. in the Bodleian Library, by Thomas Cheshire, M.A. 8vo, cloth. 3s.

**MILANDA PANHO, THE:** Being Dialogues between King Milanda and the Buddhist Sage Nāgasena. The Pali Text, edited by V. Trenckner. 440 pp. 8vo, sewed. 21s. See also "Pali Miscellany."

**MOSHEH BEN SHESHETH'S COMMENTARY ON JEREMIAH AND EZEKIEL.** See p. 22.

**MUSS-ARNOLT (W.). A CONCISE DICTIONARY OF THE ASSYRIAN LANGUAGE (Assyrian—English—German).** By W. Muss-Arnolt. Completed in 19 parts. Each 5s. net.; or bound in 2 vols., £5 net.

**NEW HEBREW SCHOOL OF POETS OF THE SPANISH-ARABIAN EPOCH.** Selected Texts, with Introduction, Notes, and Dictionary. Edited by H. Brody, Ph.D., Rabbi in Nachod (Bohemia), and K. Albrecht, Ph.D., Professor in Oldenburg (Grand Duchy). English Translation of the Introduction, etc., by Mrs Karl Albrecht. Cloth. 7s. 6d. net.

**NÖLDEKE (THEODOR, Professor of Oriental Languages in the University of Strassburg). COMPENDIOUS SYRIAC GRAMMAR.** With a Table of Characters by Julius Euting. Translated (with the sanction of the author) from the second and improved German Edition by Rev. James A. Crichton, D.D. Royal 8vo. 18s. net.

— **DELECTUS VETERUM CARMINUM ARABICORUM GLOSSARIUM CONFECIT A. MULLER.** Crown 8vo, cloth. 7s. 6d.

**NORRIS (E.). ASSYRIAN DICTIONARY.** Intended to further the Study of the Cuneiform Inscriptions of Assyria and Babylonia. Vols. I. to III. 4to, cloth. Each 28s.

**OLDENBERG (Prof. H.). BUDDHA: His Life, his Doctrine, his Order.** By Dr. Hermann Oldenberg, Professor at the University of Berlin. Translated by W. Hoey, M.A. 8vo, cloth gilt. 18s.

**PALI MISCELLANY.** By V. Trenckner. Part I. The Introductory Part of the Milanda Panho, with an English Translation and Notes. 8vo, sewed. 4s.

**PLATTS (J. T.). A GRAMMAR OF THE PERSIAN LANGUAGE.** By John T. Platts, Hon. M.A. (Oxon.), Teacher of Persian in the University of Oxford; late Inspector of Schools in the Central Provinces of India. Part I. Accidence. Broad crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**RENOUF (P. LE PAGE). LECTURES ON THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT EGYPT.** See Hibbert Lectures, p. 15.

**SADI. THE GULISTAN (ROSE GARDEN) OF SHAIK SADI OF SHIRAZ.** A new Edition of the Persian Text, with a Vocabulary, by F. Johnson. Square royal 8vo, cloth. 15s.

**SAYCE (Prof. A. H.). LECTURES ON THE RELIGIONS OF ANCIENT BABYLONIA AND SYRIA.** See the Hibbert Lectures, p. 15.

**SCHRADER (E.). THE CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.** See Theological Translation Library, Old Series, p. 9.

**SHIHĀB AL DIN. FUTŪH AL-HABASHAH; or, The Conquest of Abyssinia.** By Shināb al Din Ahmad B. 'Abd al Kādir B. Sālim B. 'Uthman. Edited, from an Arabic MS., by S. Arthur Strong. Part I. 8vo, sewed. 3s. net.

**SOCIN (Dr. A.). ARABIC GRAMMAR.** Paradigms, Literature, Exercises, and Glossary. 2nd Edition. Translated from the 3rd German Edition by the Rev. Prof. A. R. S. Kennedy, D.D. Crown 8vo, cloth. 8s. 6d.

— KEY FOR TRANSLATING THE GERMAN EXERCISES IN ABOVE GRAMMAR. Sewed. 1s. 6d.

**SÖRENSEN (S., Ph.D.). AN INDEX TO THE NAMES IN THE MAHABHARATA.** With short explanations. Royal 4to, in twelve parts, which are not sold separately, at 7s. 6d. per part net. Parts I. and III. now ready.

**STATUTES, THE, OF THE APOSTLES.** The hitherto unedited Ethiopic and Arabic Texts, with translations of Ethiopic, Arabic, and Coptic Texts, by G. Horner, M.A. See p. 26.

**TEXT AND TRANSLATION SOCIETY.** *Established  
for the purpose of editing and translating Oriental Texts chiefly  
preserved in the British Museum.*

*Volumes already issued—*

**THE SIXTH BOOK OF THE SELECT LETTERS  
OF SEVERUS, PATRIARCH OF ANTIOCH,  
in the Syriac Version of Athanasius of Nisibis.  
Edited and translated by E. W. Brooks, M.A. Vol. I.  
Text, Parts I. and II. Vol. II. Translation, Parts I. and  
II. 8*s.* net.**

**THE CANONS OF ATHANASIUS OF ALEX-  
ANDRIA, in Arabic, Ethiopic, and Coptic. Edited  
and Translated by Prof. W. Riedel (Griefswald) and W. E.  
Crum. 2*s.* net.**

**A RABBINIC COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK  
OF JOB, contained in a unique MS. at Cambridge.  
Edited, with Translation and Commentary, by W. Aldis  
Wright, LL.D. 2*s.* net.**

---

**TURPIE (Dr. D. McC.). MANUAL OF THE  
CHALDEE LANGUAGE.** Containing Grammar of the  
Biblical Chaldee and of the Targums, and a Chrestomathy,  
with a Vocabulary. Square 8vo, cloth. 7*s.*

**VINAYA PITAKAM: One of the principal Buddhist  
Holy Scriptures.** Edited in Pali by Dr. H. Oldenberg. 5  
vols. 8vo, cloth. Each 2*s.*

**WALLIS (H. W.). THE COSMOLOGY OF THE  
RIGVEDA: An Essay.** 8vo, cloth. 5*s.*

---

## IV. Modern Languages and Literature.

*A complete list of Messrs. Williams & Norgate's Educational Publications on Modern Languages may be had on application.*

**ARMY SERIES OF FRENCH AND GERMAN NOVELS.** Edited, with short Notes, by J. T. W. Perowne, M.A.

This series is equally well adapted for general reading, and for those preparing for the Army, Oxford and Cambridge Certificates, and other Examinations—in fact, for all who wish to keep up or improve their French and German. The notes are as concise as possible, with an occasional etymology or illustration to assist the memory. The books selected being by recent or living authors, are adapted for the study of most modern French and German.

**LE COUP DE PISTOLET, etc.** Prosper Merimée.  
2s. 6d.

"A book more admirably suited to its purpose could not be desired. The Editors deserve to be congratulated."—*National Observer*.

**VAILLANTE.** Jacques Vincent. 2s. 6d.

"The books are well got up, and in *Vaillante* an excellent choice has been made."—*Guardian*.

**AUF VERLORNEM POSTEN AND NAZZAR-ENA DANTI.** Johannes v. Dewall. 3s.

"Well printed, well bound, and annotated just sufficiently to make the reading of them sure as well as easy."—*Educational Times*.

**CONTES MILITAIRES.** A. Daudet. 2s. 6d.

"These stories are mainly culled from a series called *Contes du Lundi*, originally contributed by their author to the *Figaro*. Written at fever heat immediately after the great 1870 war, they show Daudet's power in many ways at its highest. . . . We therefore do more than recommend—we urge all readers of French to get the stories in some form, and the present one is both good and cheap."—*The Schoolmaster*.

**ERZÄHLUNGEN.** E. Hofer. 3s.

"The series has brought fascinating examples of fiction under the eyes of English readers in a neat and handy form. Besides having the military flavour, they are models of style."—*Scotsman*.

---

**BAYLDON (Rev. G.). ICELANDIC GRAMMAR.** An Elementary Grammar of the Old Norse or Icelandic Language. 8vo, cloth. 7s. 6d.

**BOIELLE (JAS.). FRENCH COMPOSITION THROUGH LORD MACAULAY'S ENGLISH.** Edited, with Notes, Hints, and Introduction, by the late James Boielle, B.A. (Univ. Gall.), Officier d'Académie, Senior French Master, Dulwich College, etc. etc. Crown 8vo, cloth. Vol. I. Frederick the Great. 3s. Vol. II. Warren Hastings. 3s. Vol. III. Lord Clive. 3s.

— See Victor Hugo, "Les Misérables" and "Notre Dame."

**DELBOS (L.). NAUTICAL TERMS IN ENGLISH AND FRENCH AND FRENCH AND ENGLISH.** With Notes and Tables. For the use of Naval Officers and Naval Cadets. By Leon Delbos, M.A., of H.M.S. *Britannia*, Dartmouth. 4th Edition, thoroughly revised and considerably enlarged, with additional Plates. Crown 8vo, cloth. 7s. 6d. net.

**EUGENE'S STUDENT'S COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR OF THE FRENCH LANGUAGE,** with an Historical Sketch of the Formation of French. For the use of Public Schools. With Exercises. By G. Eugène-Fasnacht, late French Master, Westminster School. 23rd Edition, thoroughly revised. Square crown 8vo, cloth, 5s. ; or separately, Grammar, 3s. ; Exercises, 2s. 6d.

**GOETHE (W. v.). ANNOTATED TEXTS.** See Educational Catalogue.

**HAGMANN (J. G., Ph.D.). REFORM IN PRIMARY EDUCATION.** Translated from Second German Edition by R. H. Hoar, Ph.D., and Richmond Barker, M.A. Crown 8vo, cloth. 2s. 6d. net.

**HOGAN (E.). CATH RUIS NA RIG FOR BOINN.** With Preface, Translation, and Indices; also a Treatise on Irish Neuter Substantives, and a Supplement to the Index Vocabulorum of Zeuss's "Grammatica Celtica." Todd Lecture Series, Vol. IV. 8vo, sewed. 3s. 6d.

— **THE LATIN LIVES OF THE SAINTS AS AIDS TOWARDS THE TRANSLATION OF IRISH TEXTS AND THE PRODUCTION OF AN IRISH DICTIONARY.** By Edmund Hogan, S.J., F.R.U.I., M.R.I.A., Royal Irish Academy's Todd Professor of Celtic Languages. Todd Lecture Series, Vol. V. 2s. 6d.

— **THE IRISH NENNIIUS FROM L. NA HUIDRE, AND HOMILIES AND LEGENDS FROM L. BREAC.** Alphabetical Index of Irish Neuter Substantives. Todd Lecture Series, Vol. VI. 2s. 6d.

**HUGO (VICTOR). LES MISÉRABLES: Les Principaux Episodes.** Edited, with Life and Notes, by the late J. Boielle. 2 vols. 6th Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth. Each 3s. 6d.

**HUGO (VICTOR).** **NOTRE DAME DE PARIS.**  
Adapted for the use of Schools and Colleges. By the late  
J. Boileau. 2 vols. 2nd Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth. Each 3s.

**LEABHAR BREAC.** The "Speckled Book," otherwise styled  
"The Great Book of Dun Doighre": a Collection of Pieces in  
Irish and Latin, transcribed towards the close of the Fourteenth  
Century. "The oldest and best Irish MS. relating to Church  
History now preserved" (*G. Petrie*). Now first published,  
from the original MS. in the Royal Irish Academy's Library.  
In imperial folio, on toned paper. In one vol., half-calf, £4, 4s.  
(200 copies only printed.)

**LEABHAR NA H-UIDHRI.** A Collection of Pieces in Prose  
and Verse, in the Irish Language, transcribed about A.D. 1100;  
the oldest volume now known entirely in the Irish language,  
and one of the chief surviving native literary monuments—not  
ecclesiastical—of ancient Ireland; now for the first time pub-  
lished, from the original in the Library of the Royal Irish  
Academy, with account of the Manuscript, description of its  
contents, index, and facsimiles in colours. In folio, on toned  
paper, half-calf. £3, 3s. (200 copies only printed.)

**LILJA (The Lily).** An Icelandic Religious Poem. By Eystein  
Asgrimson. Edited, with Translation, Notes, and Glossary, by  
E. Magnusson. Crown 8vo, cloth extra. 10s. 6d.

**LODGE (Sir O.). SCHOOL TEACHING AND  
SCHOOL REFORM.** A Course of Four Lectures on  
School Curricula and Methods, delivered to Secondary  
Teachers and Teachers in Training at Birmingham during  
February 1905. 3s.

"The work of a sensible iconoclast, who does not pull down for the  
sake of mere destruction, but is anxious to set up something more worthy in  
place of the mediævalism he attacks."—*Outlook*.

"Let me commend this wise volume not only to teachers but to all  
concerned in national education. And especially to the politician. Half an hour  
with Sir Oliver Lodge would make him realise that there are problems on the  
inner side of the school door not dreamt of in his philosophy—would make  
him feel that the more he knows of these the better will he be able wisely to  
handle those others about which he is glibly talking every day."—Dr  
MACNAMARA in the *Daily Chronicle*.

**MAORI. NEW AND COMPLETE MANUAL OF  
MAORI CONVERSATIONS.** Containing Phrases and  
Dialogues on a variety of Topics, together with a few general  
rules of Grammar, and a comprehensive Vocabulary. 4s. net.  
*See also Williams.*

**NIBELUNGENLIED.** "The Fall of the Nibelungens," other-  
wise "The Book of Kriemhild." An English Translation by  
W. N. Lettsom. 4th Edition. 8vo, cloth. 5s.

**O'GRADY (STANDISH H.). SILVA GADELICA (I.-XXXI.).** A Collection of Tales in Irish, with Extracts illustrating Persons and Places. Edited from MSS. and translated. 2 vols. Royal 8vo, cloth. 42s. Or separately, Vol. I., Irish Text; and Vol. II., Translation and Notes. Each vol. 21s.

**OORDT (J. F. VAN, B.A.). CAPE DUTCH.** Phrases and Dialogues, with Translations, preceded by short Grammatical Notes. Crown 8vo, cloth. 2s. 6d. net.

**PHILLIPPS (V., B.A.). A SHORT SKETCH OF GERMAN LITERATURE, for Schools.** By Vivian Phillipps, B.A., Assistant Master at Fettes College, Edinburgh. 2nd Edition, revised. Pott 8vo, cloth. 1s.

**ROGET (F. F.). AN INTRODUCTION TO OLD FRENCH.** History, Grammar, Chrestomathy, and Glossary. 2nd Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth. 6s.

— **FIRST STEPS IN FRENCH HISTORY, LITERATURE, AND PHILOLOGY.** For Candidates for the Scotch Leaving Certificate Examinations, the various Universities Local Examinations, and the Army Examinations. 4th Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth. 5s.

— *See also* Voltaire.

**ROSING (S.). ENGLISH-DANISH DICTIONARY.** New Edition. Large 8vo, strongly bound, half-roan. 11s. 6d.

**SCHILLER (F. VON). THE BALLADS AND SHORTER POEMS.** Translated into English Verse by Gilbert Clark. Fcap. 8vo, cloth. 5s.

— **ANNOTATED TEXTS.** *See* Educational Catalogue.

**SULLIVAN (W. K.). CELTIC STUDIES FROM THE GERMAN OF EBEL.** With an Introduction on the Roots, Stems, and Derivatives, and on Case-endings of Nouns in the Indo-European Languages. 8vo, cloth. 10s.

**TODD LECTURE SERIES (Royal Irish Academy)—**

Vol. I. Part 1. **MESCA ULAD;** or, The Intoxications of the Ultonians. Irish Text, with Translation and Notes, by W. M. Hennessy. 8vo, sewed. 1s. 6d.

Vol. II. **LEABHAR BREAC, PASSIONS AND HOMILIES FROM.** Irish Text, Translation, and Glossary, with Lecture on Irish Lexicography, by Dr. R. Atkinson. 8vo, cloth. Part 1, pages 1-34, out of print. Part 2, pages 35-958, 6s.

**TODD LECTURE SERIES—Continued.**

**Vol. III. THE CODEX PALATINO-VATICANUS.** No. 830.  
Texts, Translations, and Indices, by B. MacCarthy, D.D. 8vo, sewed.  
**2s. 6d.**

**Vol. IV. CATH RUIS NA RIG FOR BOINN.** With Preface, Translation, Indices, a Treatise on Irish Neuter Substantives, and a Supplement to the Index Vocabulorum of Zeuss's "Grammatica Celtica." By E. Hogan. 8vo, sewed. **3s. 6d.**

**Vol. V. THE LATIN LIVES OF THE SAINTS AS AIDS TOWARDS THE TRANSLATION OF IRISH TEXTS AND THE PRODUCTION OF AN IRISH DICTIONARY.** By Edmund Hogan, S.J., F.R.U.I., M.R.I.A., Royal Irish Academy's Todd Professor of the Celtic Languages. **2s. 6d.**

**Vol. VI. THE IRISH NENNIIUS FROM L. NA HUIDRE, AND HOMILIES AND LEGENDS FROM L. BREAC.** Alphabetical Index of Irish Neuter Substantives. By Edmund Hogan, S.J., F.R.U.I., M.R.I.A., Royal Irish Academy's Todd Professor of the Celtic Languages. **2s. 6d.**

**VELASQUEZ. LARGER SPANISH DICTIONARY.** Composed from the Dictionaries of the Spanish Academy, Terreros and Salva. Spanish-English and English-Spanish. 1279 pp., triple columns. 2 vols. in 1. Imp. 8vo, cloth. **24s.**

**VIGA GLUMS SAGA.** Translated from the Icelandic, with Notes and an Introduction, by Sir Edmund Head, Bart. Fcap. 8vo, cloth. **5s.**

**WEISSE (T. H.). SYSTEMATIC CONVERSATIONAL EXERCISES FOR TRANSLATING INTO GERMAN, adapted to his Grammar.** New Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth. (Key, 5s. net.) **3s. 6d.**

— **A SHORT GUIDE TO GERMAN IDIOMS:** being a Collection of the Idioms most in use. With Examination Papers. 3rd Edition. Cloth. **2s.**

**WERNER'S ELEMENTARY LESSONS IN CAPE DUTCH (AFRIKANDER TAAL).** By A. Werner and G. Hunt. 16mo, cloth. **1s. 6d.**

"We most cordially recommend this book to anyone going out to settle in South Africa. . . . The dialogues and exercises are admirably planned."

—Reformer.

"To those outward bound such a book is sure to be useful."—Practical Teacher.

**WILLIAMS (The Right Rev. W. L., D.C.L.). A DICTIONARY OF THE NEW ZEALAND LANGUAGE.** 4th Edition. Edited by the Right Rev. Bishop W. L. Williams, with numerous additions and corrections. Demy 8vo, cloth. **12s. 6d.**

— **LESSONS IN MAORI.** 3rd Edition. Fcap. 8vo, cloth. **3s.**

**YELLOW BOOK OF LECAN.** A Collection of Pieces (Prose and Verse) in the Irish Language, in part compiled at the end of the Fourteenth Century; now for the first time published from the original Manuscript in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, by the Royal Irish Academy. With Introduction, Analysis of Contents, and Index, by Robert Atkinson. 30 and 468 pp. (Royal Irish Academy's Irish facsimiles.) Large post folio, 1896, half-roan, Roxburghe, cloth sides. £4, 4s.

**ZOEGA (G. T.). ENGLISH-ICELANDIC DICTIONARY.** 8vo, cloth. 6s. net.

**ZOMPOLIDES (Dr. D.). A COURSE OF MODERN GREEK; or, The Greek Language of the Present Day.** I. The Elementary Method. Crown 8vo, cloth. 5s.

---

## V. Science.

MEDICINE—CHEMISTRY—BOTANY—ZOOLOGY—  
MATHEMATICS.

**ANNETT (H. E., M.D., D.P.H.), J. EVERETT DUTTON,** M.B., B.Ch., and **J. H. ELLIOTT, M.D.**, Toronto. **REPORT OF THE MALARIA EXPEDITION TO NIGERIA (1900).** Part I. Malarial Fever, etc. (Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Memoir III.). 10s. 6d. Part II. Filariasis (Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Memoir IV.). *Out of print separately, but is contained in the Thompson-Yates Laboratory Reports, Vol. IV., Part I.* Price 20s.

**BASTIAN (H. CHARLTON, M.A., M.D., F.R.S.). STUDIES IN HETEROGENESIS.** With 825 Illustrations from Photomicrographs. Royal 8vo, cloth. 31s. 6d.

**BENEDICT (F. E., Ph.D.). ELEMENTARY ORGANIC ANALYSIS.** Small 8vo. Pages vi + 82. 15 Illustrations. 4s. 6d. net.

**BERGEY (D. G.). HANDBOOK OF PRACTICAL HYGIENE.** Small 8vo. Pages v + 164. 6s. 6d. net.

**BERGMANN (Prof. E. von, M.D.). A SYSTEM OF PRACTICAL SURGERY.** Edited by William T. Bull, M.D. In five Imperial 8vo volumes, containing 4174 pages, with 1976 illustrations in the text and 102 superb full-page plates in colours and monochrome. Extra cloth, £6, 6s.; half leather, marble sides and edges, £7, 7s.; half morocco, £8, 8s.

**BILTZ (HENRY). THE PRACTICAL METHODS OF DETERMINING MOLECULAR WEIGHTS.** Translated by Jones. Small 8vo. Pages viii + 245. 44 Illustrations. 8s. 6d. net.

**BOLTON. HISTORY OF THE THERMOMETER.** 12mo. 96 pages. 6 Illustrations. 4s. 6d. net.

**BOYCE (RUBERT, M.B., F.R.S.). THE ANTI-MALARIA MEASURES AT ISMAILIA.** (Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Memoir XII.) Price 1s.

— **YELLOW FEVER PROPHYLAXIS IN NEW ORLEANS, 1905.** (Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Memoir XIX.) 5s. net.

**BOYCE (RUBERT), A. EVANS, M.R.C.S., and H. H. CLARKE, M.A., B.C. REPORTS ON THE SANITATION AND ANTI-MALARIAL MEASURES IN PRACTICE AT BATHURST, CONAKRY, AND FREETOWN (1905).** (Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Memoir XIV.) With 8 plates. 5s.

**BRUCE (ALEX., M.A., M.D., F.R.C.P.E., F.R.S.E.). A TOPOGRAPHICAL ATLAS OF THE SPINAL CORD.** Fcap. folio, half-leather. £2, 2s. net.

**CUNNINGHAM MEMOIRS—**

1. **CUBIC TRANSFORMATIONS.** By John Casey, LL.D. 4to, sewed. 2s. 6d.

2. **ON THE LUMBAR CURVE IN MAN AND THE APES.** By D. J. Cunningham, M.D. 13 Plates. 4to, sewed. 5s.

3. **NEW RESEARCHES ON SUN-HEAT, TERRESTRIAL RADIATION, Etc.** By Rev. Samuel Haughton, M.A., M.D. 9 Plates 4to, sewed. 1s. 6d.

4. **DYNAMICS AND MODERN GEOMETRY.** A New Chapter in the Theory of Screws. By Sir Robert S. Ball, LL.D. 4to, sewed. 2s.

5. **THE RED STARS.** Observations and Catalogue. New Edition. Edited by Rev. T. Espin, M.A. 4to, sewed. 3s. 6d.

6. **ON THE MORPHOLOGY OF THE DUCK TRIBE AND THE AUK TRIBE.** By W. K. Parker, F.R.S. 9 Plates. 4to, sewed. 3s. 6d.

7. **CONTRIBUTION TO THE SURFACE ANATOMY OF THE CEREBRAL HEMISPHERES.** By D. J. Cunningham, M.D. With a Chapter upon Cranio-Cerebral Topography by Victor Horsley, M.B., F.R.S. 4to, sewed. 8s. 6d.

8. **ON THE FLINDERS PETRIE PAPYRI.** Part I. Out of Print.

9. **ON THE FLINDERS PETRIE PAPYRI.** Part II. With 18 Autotypes. 4to, sewed 42s. net. Appendix to 8 and 9. 5s. net

10. **THE DECORATIVE ART OF BRITISH NEW GUINEA.** A Study in Papuan Ethnography. By Alfred C. Haddon, M.A. With 12 Plates, and numerous other Illustrations. 4to, sewed. 14s. net.

11. **ON THE FLINDERS PETRIE PAPYRI.** With Transcriptions, Commentaries, and Index. By John P. Mahaffy, D.D., and Prof. J. Gilbert Smyly. With 7 Autotypes 4to, sewed 42s. net.

**DURHAM (H. E., M.A., M.B., F.R.C.S.), and the late WALTER MYERS, M.B. REPORT OF THE YELLOW FEVER EXPEDITION TO PARA (1900).** (Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Memoir VII.) 4to. 7s. 6d.

**DUTTON (J. E., M.B., Ch.B.). REPORT OF THE MALARIA EXPEDITION TO THE GAMBIA.** (Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Memoir X.) 4to. 10s. 6d. net.

— and JOHN L. TODD, B.A., M.D., C.M., M'Gill. FIRST REPORT OF THE TRYPARASOMIASIS EXPEDITION TO SENEGAMBIA (1902). (Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Memoir XI.) 4to. 10s. 6d. net.

— — — **RAPPORT SUR L'EXPÉDITION AU CONGO (1903-5.)** Price 5s.

DUTTON (J. E., M.B., Ch.B.), and JOHN L. TODD, B.A., M.D., C.M., M'Gill. **THE NATURE OF HUMAN TICK-FEVER IN THE EASTERN PART OF THE CONGO FREE STATE.** (Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Memoir XVII.) 4to. With Map, 4 Plates, and 9 Temperature Charts. Price 7s. 6d. net.

ENGELHARDT (V.). **THE ELECTROLYSIS OF WATER.** 8vo. Pages x + 140. 90 Illustrations. 5s. net.

GILES (Lieut.-Col.). **GENERAL SANITATION AND ANTI-MALARIAL MEASURES IN SEKONDI, THE GOLDFIELDS, AND KUMASSI, AND A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONDITIONS OF EUROPEAN RESIDENCE IN INDIA.** (Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Memoir XV.) 4to. 7s. 6d. net.

HANTZSCH (A.). **ELEMENTS OF STEREOCHEMISTRY.** Translated by Wolf. 12mo. Pages viii + 206. 26 Figures. 6s. 6d. net.

HARDY. **ELEMENTS OF ANALYTICAL GEOMETRY.** 8vo. Pages iv + 365. 163 Figures. 8s. 6d. net.

— **INFINITESIMALS AND LIMITS.** Sm. 12mo, paper. 22 pp. 6 Figures. 1s. net.

HARNACK (AXEL). **INTRODUCTION TO THE ELEMENTS OF THE DIFFERENTIAL AND INTEGRAL CALCULUS.** From the German. Royal 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d.

HART (EDWARD, Ph.D.). **CHEMISTRY FOR BEGINNERS.** Small 12mo.

Vol. I. **Inorganic.** Pages viii. + 188. 55 Illustrations and 2 Plates. Fourth Edition. 4s. 6d. net.

Vol. II. **Organic.** Pages iv + 98. 11 Illustrations. 2s. net.

Vol. III. **Experiments.** Separately. 60 pages. 1s. net.

— **SECOND YEAR CHEMISTRY.** Small 12mo. 165 pages. 31 Illustrations. 5s. net.

HOFF (J. H. VAN'T). **STUDIES IN CHEMICAL DYNAMICS.** Revised and enlarged by Dr. Ernst Cohen, Assistant in the Chemical Laboratory of the University of Amsterdam. Translated by Thomas Ewan, M.Sc., Ph.D., Demonstrator of Chemistry in the Yorkshire College, Leeds. Royal 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d.

JOHNSTONE (J.). **BRITISH FISHERIES: Their Administration and their Problems.** A Short Account of the Origin and Growth of British Sea Fishery Authorities and Regulations. 10s. 6d. net.

**JONES (J. T. SHARE-).** **SURGICAL ANATOMY OF THE HORSE.** To be completed in 4 Parts. With above 100 Illustrations, a number being in colour. Part I. Head and Neck; Part II. Fore Limb. Price per part, 15s. net, sewed; cloth, 16s. 6d. net.

— **LIFE-SIZE MODELS,** Illustrating the Superficial Anatomy of the Limbs of the Horse. Price per set of four models, £21; or separately—Fore Limb, Inner and Outer Aspects, £6, 16s. 6d. each; Hind Limb, Inner and Outer Aspects, £6, 6s. each.

**JONES.** **THE FREEZING POINT, BOILING POINT, AND CONDUCTIVITY METHODS.** 12mo. Pages vii + 64. 14 Illustrations. 3s. net.

**JOURNAL OF THE LINNEAN SOCIETY.** Botany. At various prices. Index to Journal (Botany), 20s. Zoology. At various prices. General Index to the first 20 vols. of the Journal (Zoology) and the Zoological portion of the Proceedings, 20s.

**JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL MICROSCOPICAL SOCIETY,** containing its Transactions and Proceedings, with other Microscopical Information. Bi-monthly. Previous to 1893 at various prices; after that date bi-monthly, each 6s. net.

**JOURNAL OF THE QUEKETT MICROSCOPICAL CLUB.** Nos. 1–26, 1s. net.; Nos. 27–31, 2s. 6d. net. 1893, No. 32, and following Nos., half-yearly, 3s. 6d. net.

**LANDOLT (Dr. HANS).** **THE OPTICAL ROTATING POWER OF ORGANIC SUBSTANCES AND ITS PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS.** 8vo. Pp. xxi + 751. 83 Illustrations. 31s. 6d. net.

**LANGENBECK.** **THE CHEMISTRY OF POTTERY.** Small 12mo. Pages viii + 197. Illustrated. Out of Print. 8s. 6d. net.

**LEAVENWORTH (Prof. W. S., M.Sc.).** **INORGANIC QUALITATIVE CHEMICAL ANALYSIS FOR ADVANCED SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES.** 8vo. Pages vi + 154. 6s. 6d. net.

**LEBLANC (Dr. MAX).** **THE PRODUCTION OF CHROMIUM AND ITS COMPOUNDS BY THE AID OF THE ELECTRIC CURRENT.** 8vo. 122 pages. 5s. net.

**LIVERPOOL MARINE BIOLOGY COMMITTEE.** **MEMOIRS ON TYPICAL BRITISH MARINE PLANTS AND ANIMALS.** Edited by W. A. Herdman, D.Sc., F.R.S. All demy 8vo, stiff boards.

1. **ASCIDIA.** By W. A. Herdman. With 5 Plates. Price 2s. net.

2. **CARDIUM.** By J. Johnstone, Fisheries Assistant, University College, Liverpool. With 7 Plates. Price 2s. 6d. net.

**3. ECHINUS.** By Herbert Clifton Chadwick, Curator of the Port Erin Biological Station. With 5 Plates. Price 2s. net.

**4. CODIUM.** By R. J. Harvey Gibson, M.A., F.L.S., Professor of Botany in University College, Liverpool, and Helen P. Auld, B.Sc. With 3 Plates. Price 1s. 6d. net.

**5. ALCYONIUM.** By Sydney J. Hickson, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S., Beyer Professor of Zoology in Owens College, Manchester. With 3 Plates. Price 1s. 6d. net.

**6. LEPEOPHTHEIRUS AND LERNEA.** By Andrew Scott, Resident Fisheries Assistant at the Peel Hatchery. With 5 Plates. 2s. net.

**7. LINEUS.** By R. C. Punnett, B.A. With 4 Plates. 2s. net.

**8. PLEURONECTES.** By Frank J. Cole, Jesus College, Oxford, Lecturer in the Victoria University, Demonstrator of Zoology, University, Liverpool, and James Johnstone, B.Sc. Lond., Fisheries Assistant, University, Liverpool. With 11 Plates. 7s. net.

**9. CHONDGRUS.** By Otto V. Darbshire, Owens College, Manchester. With 7 Plates. 2s. 6d. net.

**10. PATELLA (the Common Limpet).** By J. R. Ainsworth Davis, M.A., Professor of Zoology in the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth, and H. J. Fleure, B.Sc., Fellow of the University of Wales. With 4 Plates. 2s. 6d. net.

**11. ARENICOLA (the Lug-Worm).** By J. H. Ashworth, D.Sc., Lecturer in Invertebrate Zoology in the University of Edinburgh. With 8 Plates. 4s. 6d. net.

**12. GAMMARUS.** By Margaret Cussans, B.Sc., Zoological Department, University of Liverpool. With 4 plates. 2s. net.

**13. ANURIDA.** By A. D. Imms, B.Sc. (Lond.). With 7 Plates. 4s. net.

**14. LIGIA.** By C. Gordon Hewitt, B.Sc., Demonstrator in Zoology, University of Manchester. With 4 Plates. 2s. net.

**15. ANTEDON.** By Herbert Clifton Chadwick. With 7 Plates. 2s. 6d. net.

### LONG (J. H.). A TEXT-BOOK OF URINE ANALYSIS.

Small 8vo. Pages v + 249. 31 Illustrations. 6s. 6d. net.

### MASON (W. P., Prof. of Chem.). NOTES ON QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS.

Sm. 12mo. 56 pp. 3s. 6d. net.

### MEADE (RICHARD K., B.Sc.). CHEMIST'S POCKET MANUAL.

16mo. Leather. Pocket Edition. Pages vii + 204. Out of Print. 8s. 6d. net.

### — PORTLAND CEMENT: ITS COMPOSITION, RAW MATERIALS, MANUFACTURE, TESTING, AND ANALYSIS.

Second Edition. With 100 Illustrations. 14s. 6d. net.

### MEMOIRS OF THE LIVERPOOL SCHOOL OF TROPICAL MEDICINE—

I. ROSS (R.). Malarial Fever: Its Cause, Prevention, and Treatment. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

II. ROSS (R.), H. E. ANNELL, and E. E. AUSTEN. Report of the Malaria Expedition to Sierra Leone (1899). 4to. 21s.

## LIVERPOOL SCHOOL OF TROPICAL MEDICINE—Continued.

III. ANNETT (H. E.), J. E. DUTTON, and J. H. ELLIOTT. Report of the Malaria Expedition to Nigeria (1900). I. Malarial Fever. 4to. 10s. 6d.

V. ROSS (R.) and M. L. TAYLOR. Progress Reports of the Campaign against Mosquitoes in Sierra Leone. Part I. 1901. With a Letter from Dr. Daniels regarding the results arrived at to date. 8vo. 1s. Part II. 1902. 8vo. 1s.

VI. [Not issued yet.]

VII. DURHAM (H. E.) and W. MYERS. Report of the Yellow Fever Expedition to Para (1900). 4to. 7s. 6d.

VIII. TAYLOR (M. L.). Report on the Sanitary Conditions of Cape Coast Town. 8vo. 1s.

IX. ROSS (R.). Report on Malaria at Ismailia and Suez. 8vo. 1s.

X. DUTTON (J. E.). Report of the Malaria Expedition to the Gambia. 4to. 10s. 6d. net.

XI. DUTTON (J. E.) and J. L. TODD. First Report of the Trypanosomiasis Expedition to Senegambia (1902). 4to. 10s. 6d. net. [Also contained in Thompson-Yates Laboratories Reports, V. 2.]

XII. BOYCE (R.). The Anti-Malaria Measures at Ismailia. 8vo. 1s.

XIII. DUTTON (J. E.) and J. L. TODD. Reports of the Trypanosomiasis Expedition to the Congo (1903-1904). With a Comparison of the Trypanosomes of Uganda and the Congo Free State by H. W. Thomas, M.D. M'Gill, and Stanley F. Linton, B.Sc., M.B., Liverpool, and a Note on Tsetse Flies by E. E. Austen, Zoological Department, British Museum. Paper covers. 15s.

XIV. BOYCE (RUBERT, M.B., F.R.S.), ARTHUR EVANS, M.R.C.S., H. HERBERT CLARKE, M.A., B.C., Cantab. Report on the Sanitation and Anti-Malarial Measures in practice in Bathurst, Conakry, and Freetown (1905). 4to. 8 Plates. Price 5s.

XV. GILES (Lieut.-Colonel). General Sanitation and Anti-Malarial Measures in Sekondi, the Goldfields, and Kumassi, and a Comparison between the Conditions of European Residence in India. 4to. Price 7s. 6d. net.

XVI. THOMAS (H. WOLFERSTAN, M.D., M'Gill) and ANTON BREINL, M.U.Dr., Prag. Trypanosomes, Trypanosomiasis, and Sleeping Sickness: Pathology and Treatment. 4to. 6 Plates (5 coloured) and 7 Charts. Price 12s. 6d. net.

XVII. DUTTON (J. EVERETT, M.B.) and JOHN L. TODD, B.A., M.D., M'Gill. The Nature of Human Tick-Fever in the Eastern Part of the Congo Free State. 4to. With Map, 4 Plates, and 9 Temperature Charts. Price 7s. 6d. net.

XVIII. 1. DUTTON (J. EVERETT, M.B.) and JOHN L. TODD, B.A., M.D., C.M., M'Gill. Gland Palpation in Human Trypanosomiasis; and 2. The Distribution and Spread of "Sleeping Sickness" in the Congo Free State. With 4 Maps (2 colours) and 4 Plates. 3. NEWSTEAD (R., A.L.S., F.E.S.) and JOHN L. TODD, B.A., M.D., C.M., M'Gill. A New Dermanyssid Acarid. With 1 Plate. 4. NEWSTEAD (R., A.L.S., F.E.S.). Another New Dermanyssid Acarid. With 1 Plate. 5. STEPHENS (J. W. W.,

**LIVERPOOL SCHOOL OF TROPICAL MEDICINE—Continued.**

**M.D., Cantab.) and R. NEWSTEAD, A.L.S., F.E.S.** Anatomy of the Proboscis of Biting Flies. With 6 Plates. Imp. 8vo. Price 7s. 6d. net.

**XIX. BOYCE (RUBERT, M.B., F.R.S.).** Yellow Fever Prophylaxis in New Orleans in 1905. Imp. 8vo. Maps and 6 Plates. Price 5s. net.

**XX. 1. DUTTON (J. EVERETT, M.B.), and JOHN L. TODD, B.A., M.D.** La Prophylaxie de la Malaria dans les Principaux Postes de l'État Indépendant du Congo. With 4 Maps and 4 Illustrations. Imp. 8vo. **2. BREINL (ANTON, M.D.) and A. KINGHORN, M.B.** The Animal Reactions of the Spirochæta of African "Tick-Fever." Imp. 8vo. **3. BREINL (ANTON, M.D.).** The Specific Nature of the Spirochæta of African "Tick-Fever." Imp. 8vo. Price 5s.

**XXI. RUNCORN RESEARCH LABORATORIES.** An Experimental Study of the Parasite of the African "Tick-Fever." Note on a New Spirochæta found in a Mouse. Comparison between the Trypanosomes, and other Articles. 4to. 7s. 6d. net.

**MOISSON (HENRI).** THE ELECTRIC FURNACE. 8vo. Pages x + 305. 41 Illustrations. 10s. 6d. net.

**NISSENNON.** THE ARRANGEMENTS OF ELECTROLYTIC LABORATORIES. 8vo. 81 pages. 52 Illustrations. 5s. net.

**NOTES ON SANITARY CONDITIONS OBTAINING IN PARA.** By the Members of the Yellow Fever Expedition. (Published by the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine.) 1s.

**NOYES (ARTHUR A., Ph.D.).** ORGANIC CHEMISTRY FOR THE LABORATORY. Small 12mo. Pages xii + 257. 22 Illustrations. 6s. 6d. net.

— and MULLIKEN (SAMUEL P., Ph.D.). LABORATORY EXPERIMENTS ON CLASS REACTIONS AND IDENTIFICATION OF ORGANIC SUBSTANCES. 8vo. 81 pp. 2s. net.

**OTTO (RUDOLF).** NATURALISM AND RELIGION. See Crown Theological Library, p. 12.

**PALLIN (Capt. W. A., F.R.C.V.S.).** A TREATISE ON EPIZOOTIC LYMPHANGITIS. Second Edition. Demy 8vo, cloth. 3s. 6d. net. Nearly 100 pages, 17 full-page Plates.

**PATERSON (ANDREW MELVILLE, M.D., Derby Professor of Anatomy in the University of Liverpool, Hunterian Professor at the Royal College of Surgeons of England).** THE HUMAN STERNUM. Three Lectures delivered at the Royal College of Surgeons, England, November 1903. With 10 Plates. Crown 4to. 10s. net.

**PFANHAUSER (Dr. W.). PRODUCTION OF METALLIC OBJECTS ELECTROLYTICALLY.** Now in preparation. 5s. net.

**PHILLIPS (FRANCIS C.). METHODS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF ORES, PIG IRON AND STEEL.** Second Edition. 8vo. Pages viii + 170. 3 Illustrations. 4s. 6d. net.

**PIDDINGTON (HENRY). THE SAILORS' HORN-BOOK FOR THE LAW OF STORMS.** Being a Practical Exposition of the Theory of the Law of Storms, and its uses to Mariners of all Classes in all Parts of the World. Shown by transparent Storm Cards and useful Lessons. 7th Edition. Demy 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d.

**PRAY (Dr.). ASTIGMATIC LETTERS.** Printed on Millboard, size 22 by 14 inches. 1s.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE OPTICAL CONVENTION, No. I, 1905.** Crown 4to, cloth. 10s. net.

**RANSOM (W. H., M.D., F.R.S., F.R.C.P.). THE INFLAMMATION IDEA IN GENERAL PATHOLOGY.** Demy 8vo, cloth. 7s. 6d.

**RAY (Prof. P. C.). A HISTORY OF HINDU CHEMISTRY FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE MIDDLE OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY A.D.** With Sanskrit Texts, Variants, Translation, and Illustrations. Vol. I. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.

**REPORTS OF THE THOMPSON-YATES AND JOHNSTON LABORATORIES.** Demy 4to, with Illustrations. Vol. I. 1898-9. 10s. 6d. Vol. II. 1898-9. 25s. Vol. III. Part 1. 1900. 7s. 6d. Vol. III. Part 2. 1901. 12s. 6d. Vol. IV. Part 1. 1901. 20s. Vol. IV. Part 2. 1902. 21s. New Series. Vol. V. Part 1. 1903. Limp, 20s.; cloth, 21s. Vol. V. Part 2. 1903. Limp, 12s. 6d.; cloth, 13s. 6d. Vol. VI. Part 1. 1905. Limp, 12s. 6d.; cloth, 13s. 6d. Vol. VI., Part 2, 15s. Vol. VII., Part 1, 10s. 6d.

**ROSS (RONALD, C.B., F.R.S., etc., Major I.M.S. (retired)). MALARIAL FEVER: Its Cause, Prevention, and Treatment.** (Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Memoir I.) 8vo, cloth. 2s. 6d

— **H. E. ANNELL, M.D., D.P.H., and E. E. AUSTEN. REPORT OF THE MALARIA EXPEDITION TO SIERRA LEONE (1899).** (Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Memoir II.) 4to. 21s.

**ROSS (RONALD, C.B., F.R.S., etc., Major I.M.S. (retired)). FIRST PROGRESS REPORT OF THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST MOSQUITOES IN SIERRA LEONE (1901).** With a letter from Dr. Daniels regarding the results arrived at to date. (Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Memoir V., 1.) 1s.

— **SECOND PROGRESS REPORT OF THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST MOSQUITOES IN SIERRA LEONE (1902).** By M. Logan Taylor, M.B. (Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Memoir V., 2.) 1s.

— **REPORT ON MALARIA AT ISMAILIA AND SUEZ.** (Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Memoir IX.) 1s.

**SANG'S LOGARITHMS.** A new Table of Seven-place Logarithms of all Numbers continuously up to 200,000. 2nd Edition. Royal 8vo, cloth. 21s.

**SCHREBER (D. G. M.). MEDICAL INDOOR GYMNASICS,** or a System of Hygienic Exercises for Home Use, to be practised anywhere, without apparatus or assistance, by young and old of either sex, for the preservation of health and general activity. Revised and Supplemented by Rudolf Graefe, M.D. With a large plate and 45 illustrations in the text. Royal 8vo, cloth. 3s. net.

"The exercises described, when efficiently used, will undoubtedly be of value in strengthening and developing the muscular system. The descriptions of the exercises and the figures in the text are excellent."—*Physician and Surgeon*.

"Well worthy of the attention of those who go in for regular physical training as a means for the preservation of health."—*Scotsman*.

"A very sensible little treatise."—*Glasgow Herald*.

**SCHROEN (L.). SEVEN-FIGURE LOGARITHMS OF NUMBERS** from 1 to 108,000, and of Sines, Cosines, Tangents, Cotangents to every 10 Seconds of the Quadrant. With a Table of Proportional Parts. By Dr. Ludwig Schroen, Director of the Observatory of Jena, etc., etc. 5th Edition, corrected and stereotyped. With a description of the Tables by A. De Morgan, Professor of Mathematics in University College, London. Imp. 8vo, cloth, printed on light green paper. 9s.

**SEGER. COLLECTED WRITINGS OF HERRMANN AUGUST SEGER.** (Papers on Manufacture of Pottery.) 2 vols. Large 8vo. £3, 3s. net per set; per volume, 31s. 6d. net.

**SNELLEN'S OPHTHALMIC TEST TYPES.** Best Types for the Determination of the Acuteness of Vision. 14th Edition, considerably augmented and improved. 8vo, sewed. 4s. Single Sheets: E T B, M O V, B D E, w w w, and Large Clock Sheet. 8d. each. Small Clock Sheet and R T V Z. 4d. each.

— **ASTIGMATIC TEST CHART.** Long folio, varnished, mounted on rollers. 2s. net.

**SNYDER (HARRY, B.Sc.). SOILS AND FERTILISERS.** Second Edition. 8vo. Pages x + 294. 1 Plate. 4o Illustrations. 6s. 6d. net.

**SONNTAG (C. O.). A POCKET FLORA OF EDINBURGH AND THE SURROUNDING DISTRICT.** A Collection and full Description of all Phanerogamic and the principal Cryptogamic Plants, classified after the Natural System, with an artificial Key and a Glossary of Botanical Terms. By the late C. O. Sonntag, the Royal High School, Edinburgh; formerly Secretary of the Microscopical Society of Glasgow, etc. Fcap. 8vo, limp cloth, round corners, with Map of the Environs of Edinburgh. 3s. 6d. net.

**STEPHENS (J. W. W., M.D. Cantab., D.P.H.) and S. R. CHRISTOPHERS, M.B. Vict., I.M.S. PRACTICAL STUDY OF MALARIA AND OTHER BLOOD PARASITES.** (Published for the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine). 8vo, cloth. Second Edition. 12s. 6d. net.

**STILLMAN (THOS. B., M.Sc., Ph.D.). ENGINEERING CHEMISTRY.** Third Edition. 8vo. Pages x + 597. 139 Illustrations. 19s. net.

**TAYLOR (M. LOGAN, M.B., Ch.B.). REPORT ON THE SANITARY CONDITIONS OF CAPE COAST TOWN.** (Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Memoir VIII.) 8vo. 1s.

— **REPORT OF THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST THE MOSQUITOES IN SIERRA LEONE.** See Ross and Taylor.

**THOMAS (H. WOLFERSTAN, M.D., M'Gill) and ANTON BREINL, M.U.Dr., Prag. TRYPANOSOMES, TRYpanosomiasis, AND SLEEPING SICKNESS: PATHOLOGY AND TREATMENT.** Quarto. (Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Memoir XVI.) 6 Plates (5 coloured) and 7 Charts. Price 7s. 6d. net.

**TOWER (O. F., Ph.D.). THE CONDUCTIVITY OF LIQUIDS.** 8vo. Pages iv + 190. 20 Illustrations. 7s. 6d. net.

**TRANSACTIONS OF THE EPIDEMIOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF LONDON.** New Series. Vol. XXIII. Session 1903-1904. Demy 8vo, cloth. 6s. net. The earlier volumes of the New Series, I.-XXII., are still obtainable. Price 6s. net each. **Commemoration Volume**, containing an account of the Foundation of the Society and of the Commemoration Dinner, together with an Index of the papers read at its meetings between 1855 and 1900. 8vo, cloth. 5s. net.

**TRANSACTIONS OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY OF EDINBURGH.** Vol. XXXVIII. Part 1, 40s. Part 2, 25s. Part 3, 30s. Part 4, 7s. 6d. Vol. XXXIX. Part 1, 30s. Part 2, 19s. Part 3, 43s. Part 4, 9s. Vol. XL. Part 1, 25s. Complete parts only—we do not supply separate papers. General Index to First Thirty-four Volumes (1783-1888), with History of the Institution. 4to, cloth. 21s.

**TRANSACTIONS OF THE ROYAL IRISH ACADEMY, DUBLIN.** Vols. I.-XX. 4to. £22, 5s. 6d. Vols. XXI.-XXXI. Various prices.

**TRANSACTIONS OF THE ROYAL DUBLIN SOCIETY.** Various volumes at various prices.

**VEGA. LOGARITHMIC TABLES OF NUMBERS AND TRIGONOMETRICAL FUNCTIONS.** Translated from the 40th, or Dr. Bremiker's Edition, thoroughly revised and enlarged, by W. L. F. Fischer, M.A., F.R.S., Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge; Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of St. Andrews. 75th Stereotyped Edition. Royal 8vo, cloth. 7s.

**VENABLE (T. C., Ph.D.). THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PERIODIC LAW.** Small 12mo. Pages viii + 321. Illustrated. 10s. 6d. net.

— **THE STUDY OF THE ATOM.** 12mo. Pages vi + 290. 8s. 6d. net.

— and HOWE. **INORGANIC CHEMISTRY ACCORDING TO THE PERIODIC LAW.** 12mo. Pages vi + 266. 35 Illustrations. New Edition in preparation. 6s. 6d. net.

**WILEY (HARVEY W., A.M., Ph.D.). PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE OF AGRICULTURAL CHEMICAL ANALYSIS.** Vol. I. Soils. 3 vols. 8vo. New Edition in preparation. Vol. I., ready. 18s. net.

## VI. Miscellaneous.

### ANTHROPOLOGY—SOCIOLOGY—MYTHOLOGY— BIBLIOGRAPHY, BIOGRAPHY, ETC.

**AVEBURY** (Lord, D.C.L., F.R.S., etc.) (Sir John Lubbock). **PREHISTORIC TIMES**, as Illustrated by Ancient Remains and the Manners and Customs of Modern Savages. 6th Edition, revised, with 239 Illustrations, a large number of which are specially prepared for this Edition. Demy 8vo, cloth, gilt tops. 18s.

"To anyone who wishes to obtain a succinct conspectus of the present state of knowledge on the subject of early man, we recommend the perusal of this comprehensive volume."—*Jour. Brit. Archaeol. Assoc.*

"The fact that this well-known standard work has reached a sixth edition is evidence of its value to ethnologists and archaeologists. The many and beautiful illustrations are most helpful in better understanding the plain but accurate letterpress. Lord Avebury is to be congratulated on the new edition, which is sure to further popularise a fascinating subject for investigation by cultured people."—*Science Gossip*.

"It is necessary to compare the present volume with the fifth edition in order to see how much it has been improved. The illustrations to this sixth edition are immeasurably superior to the fifth."—*Knowledge*.

**BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REGISTER.** Published Quarterly. 6d. net; 2s. 2d. per annum, post free. Nos. 1-4 ready.

**BLACKBURN (HELEN).** **WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.** A Record of the Women's Suffrage Movement in the British Isles, with a Biographical Sketch of Miss Becker. Portraits. Crown 8vo, cloth. 6s.

— See also Vynne, Nora, and Blackburn, "Women under the Factory Acts."

**BROWN (ROBERT, Jun., F.S.A.).** **SEMITIC INFLUENCE IN HELLENIC MYTHOLOGY.** With special reference to the recent mythological works of the Right Hon. Prof. Max Muller and Mr. Andrew Lang. Demy 8vo, cloth. 7s. 6d.

— **RESEARCHES INTO THE ORIGIN OF THE PRIMITIVE CONSTELLATIONS OF THE GREEKS, PHœNICIANS, AND BABYLONIANS.** With a large map of the Northern Hemisphere as viewed at Phœnicia 1200 B.C., and other maps. 2 vols. Demy 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d. each.

— **MR. GLADSTONE AS I KNEW HIM, and other Essays.** Demy 8vo, cloth. 7s. 6d.

**CATALOGUE OF THE LONDON LIBRARY**, St James's Square. By C. T. Hagberg Wright, LL.D., etc. xiv + 1626 pp. 4to, cloth. 42s. net. **Supplement I.** 1902-3. Buckram, 1 vol., 196 pp. 5s. net. **Supplement II.** 198 pp. 1903-4. Buckram. 5s. net. **Supplement III.** 1904-5. 5s. net.

"The present catalogue is essentially a working catalogue. . . . The general level of accuracy in the printing and editing of the work appears to us to be an unusually high one. . . . We heartily applaud the work, both as a landmark in library land, and as a monument standing upon a firm foundation of its own."—*The Times*.

**DIETRICHSON (L.). MONUMENTA ORCADICA.**

The Norsemen in the Orkneys, and the Monuments they have left. With a Survey of the Celtic (Pre-Norwegian) and Scottish (Post-Norwegian) Monuments on the Islands. With original Drawings, and some Chapters on St Magnus' Cathedral, Kirkwall, by Johan Meyer, Architect. Demy 4to, cloth. £3 net.

**ENGELHARDT (C.). DENMARK IN THE EARLY IRON AGE.** Illustrated by recent Discoveries in the Peat-Mosses of Slesvig. 33 Plates (giving representations of upwards of a thousand objects), Maps, and numerous other Illustrations on wood. 1866. 4to, cloth. 31s. 6d.

**GOLDAMMER (H.). THE KINDERGARTEN.** A Guide to Fröbel's Method of Education. 2 vols. in 1. 120 pp. of Illustrations. 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d.

**HARRISON (A., D.Sc.). WOMEN'S INDUSTRIES IN LIVERPOOL.** An Inquiry into the Economic Effects of Legislation regulating the Labour of Women. 8vo. 3s.

**HENRY (JAMES). ÆNEIDEA; or, Critical, Exegetical and Æsthetical Remarks on the Æneis.** With a personal collation of all the first-class MSS., and upwards of 100 second-class MSS., and all the principal editions. Vol. I. (3 Parts), Vol. II. (3 Parts), Vol. III. (3 Parts), Vol. IV. (1 Part). Royal 8vo, sewed. £2, 2s. net.

**HERBERT (Hon. A.). THE SACRIFICE OF EDUCATION TO EXAMINATION.** Letters from "All Sorts and Conditions of Men." Edited by Auberon Herbert. Half-cloth boards. 2s.

— **WINDFALL AND WATERDRIFT.** Verse Miniatures. Square 12mo, cloth limp, gilt tops. 2s.

— and **WAGER (HAROLD). BAD AIR AND BAD HEALTH.** Dedicated to Professor Clifford Allbutt. Reprinted from the "Contemporary Review." 8vo, cloth, 1s. 6d.; sewed, 1s.

**JOHNSON (E.). THE RISE OF ENGLISH CULTURE.** With a brief account of the Author's life and writings. Demy 8vo, cloth. 15s. net.

**KIEPERT'S NEW ATLAS ANTIQUUS.** Twelve Maps of the Ancient World, for Schools and Colleges. Third hundred thousand. 12th Edition, with a complete Geographical Index. Folio, boards. 6s. Strongly bound in cloth. 7s. 6d.

---

### — WALL-MAPS OF THE ANCIENT WORLD —

**WALL-MAP OF ANCIENT ITALY.** Italia antiqua. For the study of Livy, Sallust, Cicero, Dionysius, etc. Scale 1 : 800,000. Mounted on rollers, varnished. 20s.

**GENERAL WALL-MAP OF THE OLD WORLD.** Tabula orbis terrarum antiqui ad illustrandam potissimum antiquissimi ævi usque ad Alexandrum M. historiam. For the study of ancient history, especially the history of the Oriental peoples: the Indians, Medes, Persians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Egyptians, Phœnicians, etc. Scale 1 : 5,400,000. Mounted on rollers, varnished. 20s.

**GENERAL WALL-MAP OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.** Imperii Romani tabula geographica. For the study of the development of the Roman Empire. Scale 1 : 300,000. Mounted on rollers, varnished. 24s.

**WALL-MAP OF ANCIENT LATIUM.** Latii Veteris et finitimarum regionum tabula. For the study of Livy, Dionysius, etc. Scale 1 : 125,000. With supplement: Environs of Rome. Scale 1 : 25,000. Mounted on rollers, varnished. 18s.

**WALL-MAP OF ANCIENT GREECE.** Græciæ Antiquæ tabula. For the study of Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Strabo, Cornelius Nepos, etc. Scale 1 : 500,000. Mounted on rollers, varnished. 24s.

**WALL-MAP OF THE EMPIRES OF THE PERSIANS AND OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT.** Imperia Persarum et Macedonum. For the study of Herodotus, Xenophon, Justinian, Arian, Curtius. Scale 1 : 300,000. Mounted on rollers and varnished. 20s.

**WALL-MAP OF GAUL, WITH PORTIONS OF ANCIENT BRITAIN AND ANCIENT GERMANY.** Galliæ Cisalpiniæ et Transalpiniæ cum partibus Britanniæ et Germaniæ tabula. For the study of Cæsar, Justinian, Livy, Tacitus, etc. Scale 1 : 1,000,000. Mounted on rollers and varnished. 24s.

**WALL-MAP OF ANCIENT ASIA MINOR.** Asiæ Minoris Antiquæ tabula. For the study of Herodotus, Xenophon, Justinian, Arian, Curtius, etc. Scale 1 : 800,000. Mounted on rollers and varnished. 20s.

**MARCKS (ERICH), Professor of Modern History at the University of Leipzig).** ENGLAND AND GERMANY: Their Relations in the Great Crises of European History, 1500-1900. Demy 8vo, stiff wrapper. 1s.

**MUIR (Prof. Ramsay).** A HISTORY OF LIVERPOOL. With Maps, Illustrations. Crown 8vo, art linen. 6s. net.

**MUIR (RAMSAY) and EDITH M. PLATT. A HISTORY OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT IN LIVERPOOL.** From the Earliest Times to the Municipal Reform Act of 1835. 4to, cloth. 21s. net.

**OTIA MERSEIANA.** The Publication of the Arts Faculty of the University of Liverpool, Vols. I.-III. 8vo. 1899-1903. Each 10s. 6d.

**PEDDIE (R. A.). PRINTING AT BRESCIA IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.** A List of the Issues. 5s. net.

**SCHLOSS (DAVID F.). METHODS OF INDUSTRIAL REMUNERATION.** 3rd Edition, revised and enlarged. Crown 8vo, cloth. 7s. 6d. Popular Edition, 3s. 6d.

"In its new as in its old form the book is well nigh indispensable to the student who desires to get some insight into the actual facts about the various methods of industrial remuneration, and the degree of success with which they have been applied in the various trades."—*Manchester Guardian*.

"More useful than ever to the students of the labour problem."—*Political Science Quarterly*.

**SPENCER (HERBERT). AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY.** See p. 31.

— PRINCIPLES OF SOCIOLOGY. See p. 31.

— STUDY OF SOCIOLOGY. See p. 32.

— DESCRIPTIVE SOCIOLOGY. See p. 32.

**STEPHENS (GEORGE). PROFESSOR BUGGE'S STUDIES ON NORTHERN MYTHOLOGY EXAMINED.** Illustrations. 8vo, cloth. 8s.

— THE RUNES, WHENCE CAME THEY? 4to, sewed. 6s.

— OLD NORTHERN RUNIC MONUMENTS. Vol. IV. Folio. 20s. net.

**VEILED FIGURE (THE), and Other Poems.** Large post 8vo, buckram, gilt, cover designed by Mr. T. Blake Wirgman. 2s. 6d.

**VYNNE (NORA) and HELEN BLACKBURN, and with the Assistance of H. W. ALLASON. WOMEN UNDER THE FACTORY ACTS.** Part 1. Position of the Employer. Part 2. Position of the Employed. Crown 8vo, cloth. 1s. net.

**WELD (A. G.). GLIMPSSES OF TENNYSON AND OF SOME OF HIS FRIENDS.** With an Appendix by the late Bertram Tennyson. Illustrated with Portraits in photogravure and colour, and with a facsimile of a MS. poem. Fcap. 8vo, art linen. 4s. 6d. net.

"This is a delightful little book, written by one who has all the qualifications for the task—the opportunities of observation, the interest of relationship, and the sympathetic and appreciative temper. . . . We do not attempt to criticise, but only to give such a description as will send our readers to it."—*Spectator*.

"Everyone who reads the book will understand Tennyson a little better, and many will view him in a new aspect for the first time."—*Daily Chronicle*.

"It is quite worthy of a place side by side with the larger 'Life.'"—*Glasgow Herald*.

---

---

## LIST OF PERIODICALS, REVIEWS, AND TRANSACTIONS AND PROCEEDINGS OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

PUBLISHED BY WILLIAMS & NORGATE.

---

**THE HIBBERT JOURNAL: A Quarterly Review of Religion, Theology, and Philosophy.** Single numbers, 2s. 6d. net. Subscription, 10s. per annum, post free.

"There is, for English readers at least, no existing medium for expression of free-thought in this best sense ; and should anything but success await the venture of publishing 'The Hibbert Journal,' we shall confess painful surprise . . . It will be a reflection on our theological and philosophical students if they do not show full appreciation of a journal so admirably planned and so strongly commenced. . . . For the form of the journal we have nothing but praise, the print being large and the margins ample. We have never with more sincerity wished well to a new undertaking ; and should it fulfil its undoubted possibilities, 'The Hibbert Journal' must be of immense service to all serious and progressive students of the subjects with which it deals."—*Christian World*.

**THE ENGLISHWOMAN'S REVIEW OF SOCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL QUESTIONS.** Edited by Antoinette M. Mackenzie. Issued quarterly on 15th January, April, July, and October. Price 1s. Per annum, 4s. 6d., post free.

**JOURNAL OF THE FEDERATED MALAY STATES MUSEUMS.** Issued quarterly. Single numbers, 1s. 6d. net. Subscription, 5s. per annum.

**JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL MICROSCOPICAL SOCIETY,** containing its Transactions and Proceedings, with other Microscopical Information. Bi-monthly. 6s. net. Yearly subscriptions, 37s. 6d., post free.

**JOURNAL OF THE QUEKETT MICROSCOPICAL CLUB.** Issued half-yearly, April and November. Price 3s. 6d. net. 7s. 6d. per annum, post free.

**LINNEAN SOCIETY OF LONDON.** Journal of Botany and Journal of Zoology. Published irregularly at various prices.

---

LIST OF PERIODICALS, Etc.—Continued.

**ROYAL SOCIETY OF EDINBURGH.** Transactions.  
Issued irregularly at various prices.

**LIVERPOOL MARINE BIOLOGY COMMITTEE.**  
Memoirs. I.—XV. already published at various prices. Fauna  
of Liverpool Bay. Fifth Report, written by Members of the  
Committee and other Naturalists. Cloth. 8s. 6d. net. *See p. 48.*

**LIVERPOOL UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF COMMERCIAL RESEARCH IN THE TROPICS.**  
Quarterly. Journal Numbers, 2s. net.

**MEMOIRS OF THE LIVERPOOL SCHOOL OF TROPICAL MEDICINE.** *See p. 49.*

**ROYAL ASTRONOMICAL SOCIETY.** Memoirs and  
Monthly Notices. Yearly volumes at various prices.

**ROYAL IRISH ACADEMY.** Transactions and Proceedings  
issued irregularly; prices vary. Cunningham Memoirs. Vols.  
I.—X. already issued at various prices.

**ROYAL DUBLIN SOCIETY.** Transactions and Proceedings.  
Issued irregularly at various prices.

**REPORTS OF THE THOMPSON-YATES LABORATORIES.** *See p. 52.*

**TRANSACTIONS OF THE EPIDEMIOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF LONDON.** *See p. 55.*







UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY



127 990

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY

